THE RELEVANCE OF THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATES TO ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SETTINGS FOR STUDENTS IN A CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM AS IDENTIFIED BY THE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN SELECTED CHARTER SCHOOLS IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

VANCE CORTEZ-RUCKER

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2007

Major Subject: Educational Administration

THE RELEVANCE OF THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATES TO ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SETTINGS FOR STUDENTS IN A CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM AS IDENTIFIED BY THE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN SELECTED CHARTER SCHOOLS IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

VANCE CORTEZ-RUCKER

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	John Hoyle
Committee Members,	Luana Zellner
	Virginia Collier
	Alvin Larke
Head of Department,	Jim Scheurich

December 2007

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

The Relevance of the Effective School Correlates to Alternative Educational Settings for Students in a Correctional System as Identified by the Teachers and Administrators in Selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas. (December 2007)

Vance Cortez-Rucker, B.S., Ouachita Baptist University;

M.Ed., University of North Texas

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. John Hoyle

The State of Texas accepted the Effective School Research model and its correlates as a way of determining whether the state's schools are effective. This included all juvenile justice alternative educational facilities.

The purpose of the study was to assess the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by the teachers and administrators in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

Secondly, the study was to suggest modification to the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to an alternative educational setting for students in the correctional system in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

The literature revealed a potential lack of fit between the Effective School Correlates as the "Key Characteristic of Effective Schools" and their relevance to the

context of alternative schools for students in the correctional systems. This study led to the postulation that the Effective School Correlates as written may need altering to meet the needs of the specialized correctional school setting. However, it is not clear what shape or direction this alteration would take.

Findings of this study indicated that problems existed with the application of the Correlates as they related to the selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas. The population size limited the study and caution should be taken not to over-generalize the data.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Sandy, who has stood by me through all of these challenges of writing, editing, defending and completion of this endeavor. Her tireless dedication to my completion of this dream I say to her, thank you.

To my father, Vance Cortez Rucker, Sr., and mother, Jacqueline, for their determination to make me the first college graduate in my family. My mother, who instilled within me the love of reading and the thirst for knowledge, I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

"The responsibility and ramifications of educating American youth is awesome, and calls for an extraordinary commitment from those involved" (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985, p. 302). The authors go on to say, "before proceeding with any school improvement process or program, each professional unit, so dedicated, would serve all students' best interest by asking, "What is our motive for doing this? What are our expectations?" Janet Chrispeels (2002) reminded us that the late Ron Edmonds, one of the pioneers of research on Effective Schools, led the belief that "all children can learn." She further stated that it was this work by Edmonds and the subsequent 20 years of research that now have educators in the process of translating the research into action. She contended that not only is there the task of translating the research, but then having the political will to make the change.

Michael E. Dantley (1990) stated rather strongly that,

> The Effective Schools movement proclaims a resolution to the dilemmas facing students who are at risk in urban poor schools. Schools according to proselytes of the Effective Schools liturgy, are bland and frictionless institutions which, when led by effective principals who embrace this paradigm, become institutions that automatically meet the specific needs of poor urban students (p. 585).

He went on to imply that the rather simplistic regimen Effective School proponents suggest reveals a systematic autism which fails to take into consideration the social and

---

This dissertation follows the style and format of *The Journal of Educational Research.*

economic realities of the movement's rather limited perspective of schools: the intricacies and multidimensional aspects of organizations, schools, and leadership frequently are ignored. The author goes on to suggest that organization is the area of Effective Schools that must be approached. He supported this idea with definitions about organizations from Schon (1986), who defined organizations as "repositories of cumulatively built up knowledge: principles and maxims of practice, images of mission and identity, facts about the task environments, techniques of operation, and stores of past experience which serve as exemplars for future actions" (p. 586). Continuing, Dantley said that March (1986) implied that organizations are neither unconditionally malleable nor unconditionally rigid; rather, they are a set of complicated collections of interests and beliefs. He said that these interests and beliefs will act in response to a set of competing signals based on the environment in relation to persons in the organization. In his 1990 article, Daniel Levine cautioned that for this very reason organizations cannot be perceived as rational. He further suggested that organizations must be viewed as non-rational, continually forming and shaping entities. From this premise he then warned, "At the outset, caution is recommended in drawing conclusions from Effective School Research and in deriving implications for practices in the field. Among the reasons for urging potential users of this literature to guard against simplistic interpretations are the following:

1. Much of the research involves inherently problematic multivariate analysis that tends to base conclusions on schools that have been identified as

effective, but that do differ greatly in achievement from other schools of comparable socioeconomic composition . . .

2. Case studies and other descriptive analyses of unusually effective schools are susceptible to some of the same problems (i.e., failure to take adequate account of socioeconomic status and dependence on assessment of lower order learning . . .)

3. Authors of different studies generally use different definitions and instruments to assess and collect information on school characteristics. Variations in terminology and instrumentation mean that characteristics identified as important in some studies will not be citied in others that did not even attempt to examine them . . .” (pp. 577-578).

Robert Coe and Carol Fitz-Gibbon (1998), implied that research on School Effectiveness is one of the biggest growth areas in education research over recent years. Both suggested that this field of research is more than just a field of theoretical academic research. They suggested that this research is and should be an applied discipline, with direct implications for the well-being of our national educational system. However, they also cautioned that to date research on School Effectiveness has been characterized by largely overstated claims and poor modeling.

Dantley (1990), in his article shared several concerns about the Effective School Research model and its overall application to public schools. He stressed that the work by Dr. Edmonds avoids the essential grappling with issues such as unfair distribution of goods and services, the need to alter the current social order, and the causes for the

discrepancies in pedagogical strategies between middle-class and urban poor classrooms. He further stated that Sizemore (1985) in her writings points to contention with Edmonds' model by suggesting that his work on Effective Schools for the urban poor ignores the questions about race and class compositions. Dantley also contends that the Effective School Research model fails to consider certain features of American society that systematically obviate the inclusion of what the dominant culture designates as the educated, learned, or good members of marginalized ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic groups into society's mainstream. He also cautions that questions of ethics and value that focus upon the social efficacy of current societal functions, beliefs, and predispositions are left unasked by the Effective School movement. The author suggests that, the current movement lauds and essentially promotes an assimilationist response from disenfranchised groups to the current educational institutions, it has failed to recognize a lack of interconnection with these groups.

Texas Education Code Chapter 37, section 11 (Texas Education Agency, Chapter 37, 2004), gives the local juvenile justice boards with populations greater than 125,000 the responsibility of creating alternative educational programs for incarcerated youth. This code and its sections also govern local public schools. The demographics of the juvenile offenders who attend these schools indicate a student who is mostly minority, poor, abused, and neglected, with a family history of crime and disenfranchisement.

Marie Jones and Eleanor Ross (1994) related that the Hawkins-Stafford Law of 1988 codified the Effective School Research model and its correlates into federal education policy.

The State of Texas accepted the Effective School Research model and its correlates as a way of determining whether the state's schools are effective. This included all juvenile justice alternative educational facilities (Texas Education Agency, Effective School Correlates, 2004).

Statement of the Problem

The literature reveals a potential lack of fit between the Effective School Correlates as the "Key Characteristic of Effective Schools" and their relevance to the context of alternative schools for students in the correctional systems. This study led to the postulation that the Effective School Correlates as written may need altering to meet the needs of the specialized correctional school setting. However, it is not clear what shape or direction this alteration would take.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to assess the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by the teachers and administrators in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

Secondly, the results of the study will be used to suggest modification to the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to an alternative educational setting for students in the correctional system in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

Research Questions

The answers to the following questions will be sought in this study:

1. To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

2. To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in the correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

3. How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County,

Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system?

Operational Definitions

Effective School Correlates: A body of knowledge developed from research that gives educators direction in developing more effective schools for all students. These correlates have come to be referred to as the "Key Characteristics of Effective Schools." The correlates are:

Clear and Focused School Mission

Instructional Leadership

Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

High Expectations for All

The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task

Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning

Positive Home-School Relations

(Edmonds, 1979)

Selected Charter Schools: For the purpose of this study, the selected Charter Schools will be three specialized alternative schools within the Brown Charter School System. They are identified as schools: A, B, and C.

Stakeholders: For the purpose of this study, stakeholders will be teachers and administrators in the schools selected for this study.

Limitations

1. The study will be limited to teachers and administrators of three selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas.
2. Care should be taken in generalizing the findings of this study to any group other than the selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas.

Significance Statement

At present the literature reveals a potential lack of fit between the Effective School Correlates as the "Key Characteristics of Effective Schools" and their relevance to the context of alternative school for students in the correctional systems. The results of this study will contribute to the literature and body of knowledge concerning the differences. It may also aid in focusing a body of literature that to date has little research-based information pertaining to these highly specialized alternative schools.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I has provided an introduction and overview of the problem. Chapter II provides a review of the current literature to support the study. The review has been organized into two major sections.

The first section is the review of alternative educational settings in correctional systems in Texas. This section contains a brief review of the different types of alternative school settings. The second section of this chapter will review the Effective School movement. Within this section there will be a brief review of four areas: The historical developments of the Effective School Correlates, the role of the Effective School Correlates, the assumptions of the Effective School Correlates, and the limitations of the Effective School Correlates. Chapter II describes the methodology employed, including sampling, instrumentation, and data analysis. The next chapter documents the results obtained by the postal questionnaire. The final chapter provides a summary of the study's findings and conclusions. Recommendations for practice and directions for future research are also included in this chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the current literature to support the study. The review has been organized into two major sections. The first section is a brief review of alternative educational settings in correctional systems in Texas. This section contains a brief review of the different types of alternative school settings. The second section of this chapter reviews the Effective School movement. Within this section there will be a brief review of four areas: The historical developments of the Effective School Correlates, the role of the Effective School Correlates, the assumptions of the Effective School Correlates, and the limitations of the Effective School Correlates.

The Alternative Educational Settings in Correctional Systems in Texas

Texas Education Code Chapter 37, section 11 (Texas Education Agency, Chapter 37, 2004), states that the juvenile board of a county with a population greater than 125,000 shall develop a juvenile justice alternative educational program, subject to the approval of the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. These programs must adhere to all the specific code requirements located in Texas Education Code Chapter 37. Requirements for juveniles to be placed in these programs are located in detail in Texas Education Code Chapter 37, sub-sections A-G.

The Texas Youth Commission operates year-round educational programs for incarcerated youth ages 10 through 21. The primary goal of the Texas Youth Commission educational program is to provide each youth the opportunity to learn the

maximum educational skills possible during the time the youth is a student (Texas Youth Commission Programs and Facilities, 2004).

The Texas Youth Commission, along with its specialized treatment partners, breaks down youth offenders into several categories. These categories are: Capital and Serious Violent Offenders, Sex Offenders, Chemically Dependent Youth, and Emotionally Disturbed Youth (Texas Youth Commission, Research and Data, 2004). The Commission further describes these incarcerated youth with the following criteria: (1) 90% are young men, (2) 10% are young women, (3) 44% are Hispanic, (4) 31% are African-American, (5) 25% are Anglo, (6) 33% admitted at intake that they are gang members, (7) median age at commitment is 16, (8) median reading and math achievement level is 5th or 6th grade, (9) 77% have IQs below the mean score of 100, (10) 54% have a high need for drug treatment, (11) 48% are severely emotionally disturbed, (12) 69% have parents who never married or who divorced or separated, (13) 43% have a history of being abused or neglected, (14) 59% come from low-income homes, (15) 79% come from chaotic environments, (16) 55% have families with histories of criminal behavior, (17) 11% have family members with mental impairments, and (18) 56% were in juvenile court on two or more felon-level offenses before being committed to the Texas Youth Commission (Texas Youth Commission, Research and Data, 2004).

The Commission's latest statistics (Texas Youth Commission, Statistics and Reports, 2004) report that approximately 2,511 juveniles were admitted to the alternative youth offender programs during the year 2003. This brought total bed capacity, for that

year, within the program to 4,825 juveniles. The latest statistics for types of alternative educational treatments within the programs are based on 2001 data and reflect the following: (1) 28% had committed Capital and Serious Violent Crimes, (2) 30% were Sex Offenders, (3) 35% were Chemically Dependent Youth, and (4) 29% were Emotionally Disturbed Youth. The total bed capacity for the year 2001 was 5,524 (Texas Youth Commission, Statistics and Reports, 2004).

At the present time, the Texas Youth Commission operates 14 facilities across the state. In support of the state programs are many privately owned alternative school facilities for adjudicated youth (Texas Youth Commission, Programs and Facilities, 2004). All alternative educational programs in the state are based on the four categories: (1) Capital and Serious Violent Offenders, (2) Sex Offenders, (3) Chemically Dependent Youth, and (4) Emotionally Disturbed Youth. Within these categories is a specialized sub-population.

In 1999, the 76th Legislature passed Senate Bill 1607. This Bill established a residential infant care and parenting program for teen mothers who are incarcerated. (Texas Youth Commission, Programs and Facilities, 2004). Current accommodations in the state facility are 12.

In cooperation with the Texas Youth Commission and the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, privatization of specialized alternative schools for incarcerated youth is ongoing in Harris County, Texas (Brown Schools, 2004). At present, there are six unique juvenile justice program sites. The main objective of the programs is to work with the juvenile commissions to accommodate the needs of the students and allow their

highest academic potential, while enhancing their emotional, intellectual, moral, and physical development (Brown Schools, 2004).

In a recent report commissioned by the Texas Education Agency entitled, "A Report on Safe Schools Programs, August 1999," data indicated that the state paid $28 million in fiscal year 1998 and again in 1999 for alternative educational programs. The report further stated that to date the programs have not generated sufficient data to support that they have a positive effect on students (Texas Education Agency, 1999).

The Effective School Movement

The historical development of the effective school correlates. In a cover article by the Association for Effective Schools (Lezotte, 1996), it describes in brief the historical nature of the Effective School movement. The movement and subsequent research was a response to the federal paper written by Dr. James Coleman, a prominent education researcher. Within this paper, Dr. Coleman concluded that public schools didn't make a significant difference. He credited the student's family background as the main reason for student success in school. Dr. Coleman further stated that lacking the prime conditions or values to support education certain students could not learn, regardless of what the school did. The cover article then explained the reaction by Dr. Ronald Edmonds, then the Director of the Center for Urban Studies at Harvard University. Dr. Edmonds, and others, refused to accept Dr. Coleman's report as conclusive, although they acknowledged that family background does indeed make a difference. The article goes on to say that the challenge by these professionals was to find schools where kids from low-income families were highly successful, and thereby prove that schools can

and do make a difference. The major researchers at the time that were determined to dispel Dr. Coleman's paper were Dr. Edmonds, Dr. Wilber Brookover, and Dr. Lawrence Lezotte. The report stated that, while their research showed many schools where low-income students were learning, they were left without an answer as to why.

Pam Sammons (1999) briefly stated that the major impetus for research in effective schools in both North America and Britain was a reaction to the deterministic interpretations of findings by researchers Coleman and Jencks. David Murray (1995) introduced his paper to the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association by reminding them that the "roots" of the Effective Schools movement could be traced to the late Ronald Edmonds, a researcher and educator from Harvard University. He went on to explain that it was unfortunate that Dr. Edmonds died in 1983 before he could fully realize his contributions to school improvement efforts. He further stated that Dr. Edmonds' work challenged the theory that familial effects outweighed any school effects on learning. Some of these familial effects included the family's socio-economic status, location, or population composition.

Ronald Edmonds (1979) stated that we can teach children whenever and wherever we choose. He said that we can do this successfully. The author further stated that we already understand how to do this, but contends that we must question ourselves as to why we haven't so far.

Eugene Eubanks and Ralph Parish (1992) in a paper which revisited the history of Effective Schools related that Ronald Edmonds' work added to knowledge about school organization. The authors suggested that the Effective School Correlates created

by Edmonds are simply an ongoing collection of "known knowledge." They implied that Edmonds' work simply indicated an organizational profile that produced schooling outcomes that were not correlated with race or class. Edmonds' work showed that this type of organizational pattern in such schools created success at the same percentage of students whether they were from a privileged background or a less privileged background. They further suggested that Dr. Edmonds' work also showed a growth across the board relative to top and bottom quartiles. Thus, Edmonds made the argument that schools could make a difference separate from other social/cultural factors in the society. Pam Sammons (1999) in her article also concluded that the correlates were "common sense." "There is a grain of truth in this argument. Because school effectiveness research by its very nature sets out to identify the components of good practice . . . it is inevitable that some of the findings are unsurprising to practitioners" (p. 46). In a later research article that reviewed school effectiveness research by Pam Sammons, Josh Hillman, and Peter Mortimore (1995), they found other researchers who had concluded the same thing. In their paper they quoted Rutter et al. (1979). . . "research into practical issues, such as schooling rarely comes up with findings that are totally unexpected. On the other hand it is helpful in showing which of the abundance of good ideas available are related to successful outcomes" (p. 25).

Research on Effective Schools has been a major area of growth in educational studies (Coe & Fitz-Gibbon, 1998). The authors suggested that this area of study is more than just a thriving field of theoretical academic research; they implied that it is an applied discipline. This discipline was described by the authors as having direct

implications for the well-being of the national educational system and directly affecting the lives of all those who work within the system. They suggested that the Effective School Research is vital and must be done correctly.

Cynthia L. Uline, Daniel M. Miller, and Megan Tschannen-Moran (1998) wrote that school effectiveness literature spans three decades. The authors further stated that the research has analyzed large regional and national data sets, conducted in-depth qualitative case studies, and has mixed these research models across reasonably large samples of schools. They further implied that the large body of research will strengthen the theory directing this empirical work.

Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) wrote that, "the First International Congress of School Effectiveness and Improvement, held in London in January of 1988 and the subsequent launch of its own journals, were significant points in this development, and the annual expansion has continued ever since" (p. 421).

Sammons et al. (1995) implied that the effectiveness research is generally recognized to have been a reaction to the deterministic interpretation of findings by Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) and, in particular, their pessimistic view of the potential influence of schools, teachers, and education on students' achievement. The writers continued to suggest that early effectiveness research incorporated explicit aims or goals. They further stated that these goals were concerned with equity and excellence. "The three important features were:

1. Clientele (poor/ethnic minority children)
2. Subject matter (basic skills in reading and math)

3. Equity (children of the urban poor should achieve at the same level as those of the middle class)" (p. 3).

The writers contended that the early research had a limited and specific focus.

The authors shared that the overall reason for Effective School Research, and thus the central focus, is explained by Reynolds and Creemers (1990) who stated, "The central focus of school effectiveness research concerns the idea that schools matter, that schools do have a major effect upon children's development and that, to put it simply, schools do make a difference" (p. 4).

Murray (1995) in his paper, "Analysis of Parent Perceptions on Effective School Correlates: A Springboard for Planning" remarked that,

> The Effective Schools movement in the United States, having its origins with such pioneer researchers and school reformers as Ronald Edmonds of Harvard University and Lawrence Lezotte of Michigan, has steadily grown and emerged to be one of the most respected ways of assessing school improvement (p. 4).

Mr. Murray identified five Effective School Correlates that are directly related to the late Ron Edmonds. These correlates are:

1. Strong instructional leadership
2. Clear instructional focus
3. Positive school climate
4. High expectations
5. Measurement of student achievement

According to Mr. Murray, some states have extended these original correlates to include others. In New York, the State Education Department extended the original correlates to include 11 characteristics. Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) stated in relation to the correlates that "Commonly cited are Edmonds' (1979) 'five-factor model,' Purkey and Smith's (1983) model with eight factors, and Mortimore et al. (1988), who expanded the list to 12" (p. 430). Texas (Texas Education Agency, Effective School Correlates, 2004) has determined there are seven correlates:

1. Clear and focused school mission
2. Instructional leadership
3. Frequent monitoring of student progress
4. High expectations for all
5. The opportunity to learn and student time-on task
6. Safe and orderly school environment for learning
7. Positive home-school relations

In a quote in the preface to the book, *A Place Called School*, by John I. Goodlad (2004), Daedalus stated, "The problems confronting American Schools are substantial; the resources available to them are in most instances severely limited; the stakes are high, and it is by no means preordained that all will go well for many of them in the end" (p. 1). Goodlad (2004) remarked in chapter one of his book that American schools are in trouble. In fact, he continues, the problems of schooling are of such crippling proportions that many schools may not survive. Later in the chapter the author discussed the basic premise that we have not outgrown our needs for schools. He said that should

schools suddenly cease to exist, we would find it necessary to reinvent them. He went on to say that schools we need now are not necessarily the schools we have known in our past. He also criticizes the current wave of criticism due to what he explained as a lack of diagnosis required for the reconstructions of schooling. He said that the criticism is in part psychologically motivated—a product of a general lack of faith in ourselves and our institutions.

Another related article, which was a case study by Marie Jones and Eleanor Ross (1994), took the opportunity to relate the history of the Effective Schools movement in the United States. These two authors give a structural characteristic of the educational system in the United States which bears repeating:

> The structure of the educational system in the United States has been described by Bowman and Deal (1991) as loosely coupled and comprised of multiple layers of semi-autonomous, sociopolitical organizations, groups, and individuals combined tenuously into a system, the purpose of which is to form, fund, and implement educational policy. Within that loosely coupled structure there are at least three formal organizational levels of control, the U.S. Department of Education, the Departments of Education of the fifty plus states and outlying areas, and the thousands of individual local school boards (p. 4).

These authors referred to the 1983 study, "A Nation at Risk," as the impetus that created school reform. This study indicated to the American public that their children were significantly less educated than their counterparts in other countries. While historically

here had been research on Effective Schools dating back to the mid 1970s, the authors contended it was this study that focused the nation.

> The codification of the Effective Schools Research school improvement process into federal law in 1988, in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provided a means for forging new and more cooperative relationships among the formal organizational levels of public education (p. 6).

The authors further remarked that a continuation of this research moved forward with the integration of Deming's work into the school improvement process. Historically, it is good here to review the actual remarks by Edmonds, which were worked into the Hawkins-Stafford Law of 1988. Jones and Ross suggested that the characteristics of Effective Schools codified into law in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments came directly from the work of Ronald Edmonds. In his characterization of Effective Schools, Edmonds said:

1. They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together;
2. Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement;
3. The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet

without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand;

4. Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities;

5. When necessary, school energy and resources can be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives; and

6. There must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored. These means may be as traditional as classroom testing on the day's lesson or as advanced as criterion-referenced system-wide standardized measures. The point is that some means must exist in the school by which the principal and the teachers remain constantly aware of pupil progress in relationship to instructional objectives (Edmonds, 1979, p. 8).

The two authors go on to indicate that later research by Lawrence Lezotte and others discovered that long-term school improvement required a systemic approach and went beyond the original indicators set forth by Dr. Edmonds. This became the next stage of research in Effective School and is now highlighted by two new strategies. Thus, according to the authors, the Effective School Research model embraces a systemic change approach that (1) involves the study and application of organizational theory and strategies that include the concept of continuous improvement, and (2) when defined in the context of the educational organization and in the effective school, refers to increased and continuously improving achievement.

To put the historical review of the Effective School Research and the subsequent correlates into prospective, a brief statement from an article by Joseph J. D'Amico (2001) has been included. In his article on reviewing the achievement gap of minorities he gives us a brief historical overview:

> The notion of an 'achievement gap' between America's minority and non-minority populations is not new. Lucas (2000) notes that as early as 1785, Thomas Jefferson saw it as an issue when he wrote his Notes on Virginia. Lucas also points out that W.E.B. Du Bois made its elimination a cornerstone of his agenda. And of course the history of the civil rights movement and concomitant court decisions highlights that the 'gap' has long been a major political, economic, and educational focal point of this country (p. 1).

In an article on serving disadvantaged youth, Bruno Manno, Gregg Vanourek and Chester Finn, Jr. (1999), gave us an excellent statistical description of the youth who attend urban schools. They wrote that in many large American cities, one can find some exceptional effective public schools. In these schools the disadvantaged youth are learning and being well prepared for the workplace and their role as proper citizens, as well as preparation for higher education. Yet, at the same time, the authors contended, the educational outcomes for most students are disappointing. The writers quoted the U.S. Secretary of Education, Richard Riley from 1994, who expounds the belief that some places "should never be called schools at all" (p. 429). It is within the framework of these statistics that we are reminded of the reasoning and impetus to move forward with Effective School Research. In the article they reminded the reader that, of the 11

million youngsters who attend urban schools, 35% come from poor families and 43% are members of a minority group. Using the data from articles written in *Education Week* (1998), the authors tell us that most 4th graders who live in U.S. cities can't read and understand simple children's books and most 8th graders can't use arithmetic to solve simple mathematical problems. The graduation rate for urban schools is slightly more than 50% in four years. When the authors compared 4th graders in non-urban schools who reach 'the basics' in reading with a success of 63%, the data show that 43% of students in urban schools and only 23% in poverty urban schools reached the same levels. According to the authors, the data indicate that the longer a student stayed in an urban school setting, the wider the performance gap grew. "Somehow, simply being in an urban school seems to drag down performance" (p. 429). As the article approached the question of reform:

> Inside the system reform efforts led many urban superintendents to engage in what University of Virginia political scientist Frederick Hess (1999) calls policy churn: 'hyperactive reform agendas [where] … the sheer amount of activity—the fact that reform is the status quo—impeded the ability of any particular reform to have a lasting effect (pp. 158, 178). Studying 57 urban districts he found that, between 1992 and 1995, the average school system implemented 11.4 different proposals for change (p. 430).

The Role of Effective School Correlates

John Goodlad, Corinne Mantle-Bromley, and Stephen Goodlad (2004) commented in chapter one of their book, *Education for Everyone*, that we have always

had education, and it is always with us. Some of it is intentional; most of it is unintentional. In the history of humankind, schools are relatively new. Later, in chapter six there is a statement that best describes the role of Effective School Correlates. In this statement, the authors explain that educational renewal is primarily designed to do two things. First, it is designed generally to prevent present conditions from deteriorating and to address problems that arise. But because schools are not yet-nor are they likely ever to be-good enough simply to maintain, renewal is, second, designed to make it possible to effect changes and to sustain those changes that prove desirable.

Greg Druian (1986) strengthened the belief in the Effective School Correlates in his article. But he questioned the application of those correlates. He remarked that, while there is a growing belief and a general consensus among educators, that the characteristics of Effective Schools can be identified and described. He commented that there is an emerging question among these same educators as to how widely the indicators of Effective Schools may be applied.

In a study by John W. Evers and Trudy Bacon (1994), which was based on the Effective School Correlates and their application in a questionnaire, the staff was asked to rate the correlates as they presented themselves in sixteen schools of which eight were high performing and eight were low performing. The results of the study were to discover the perceptions of the Effective School components as a means to school improvement and accountability. Good and Brophy (1986) and Purkey and Smith (1983) were quoted by the authors to provide background for the use of the correlates. These four authors stated that Effective School Research had consistently identified five to

seven factors that correlated to improved school achievement. These factors include a sense of mission, strong building leadership, high expectations for students and staff, frequent monitoring of student progress, a positive and orderly learning environment, sufficient opportunity for learning, and parent/community involvement. In their 2001 article, Barker and Robinson (2001), confirmed that the Effective School Correlates are the "core characteristics where students learn and achieve" (p. 4).

Lezotte and Bancroft (1985) discussed the desire for school improvement in the United States and the use of Effective School Research. In their article, the authors discussed the reform movement as a reaction to the 'media blitz' calling for reform and the assumptions by American Society that by implementing the recommendations of the Effective School Research, 'school improvement' will occur. The two authors further stated that there are distinctive attributes to Effective School Research as it applies to school reform. They both stressed that this reform, when taken as a set, provides a rationale for why this approach to school improvement holds promise for economically disadvantaged and minority students.

According to Lezotte and Bancroft (1985), the three major attributes of Effective School Research and its role in reform are: Quality and Equity, Research Based, and Data Driven. They then go forward and list attributes that they feel are important.

The first attribute of Effective School Research is the quality and equity of educational opportunity. The authors stressed that a school must be able to demonstrate that both quality and equity are concurrently present. The authors stated that the effectiveness to this question can be summed up by asking, "What does the nation want

from its public schools?" The consistent response by the public of this country, according to the authors, is that they expect children to experience a quality education and they believe that all school children should have equal educational opportunity. The authors commented that if this is the perceived educational mission of our public schools, then it would follow that any school wishing to claim that it is effective will be able to substantiate that claim. They further stated that any school embarking on school improvement will incorporate quality and equity into its purpose and goals.

The second attribute of Effective School Research, according to the authors, is school improvement based on a research–founded model. This research model is based on fifteen years of study, three interdependent bodies of related research, effective staff development, effective organization development in education, and effective planned change programs. Both authors stressed that as we move further into the use of the model more knowledge through application will be gained.

The third attribute discussed by Lezotte and Bancroft (1985) is that the model is data driven. The weight of measurable or observable evidence is very important. Data driven evidence is useful for planning, according to the authors. They asserted that data also offers flexibility for attending to what is important and necessary. As new information arrives, the teachers and students can modify the goals. This ability to use data allows for flexibility and versatility.

In the book, *School Effectiveness: Coming of Age in the Twenty-First Century*, by Sammons (1999), the author took a close look at the impact, understanding, and use of Effective School Research. She stated that the major focus of school effectiveness

research concerns the idea that "school matters, that schools do have major effects upon children's development and that, to put it simple, schools do make a difference" (Reynolds & Creemers, 1990, p. 1).

In a paper presented at the Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, by William Webster and Robert Mendro (1994), the authors wrote that the School Effectiveness Methodology defines that effectiveness is based on exceptional measured performance above that which would be expected across the entire school district.

Eubanks and Parish (1992) in their paper, "Effective Schools Tinkering and School Cultures: Maintaining Schools that Sort by Race, Class, and Gender," implied that the role of Effective School Research has now become part of the language of numerous schools and colleges of education. The authors go on to suggest that the research and the correlates are now an integral part of American schooling.

Dantley (1990) said that the Effective School Movement proclaims a resolution to the dilemmas facing students who are at risk in urban poor schools. He further stated that proselytes of the Effective Schools liturgy describe these schools as bland and frictionless institutions which, when led by effective principals who embrace this paradigm, become institutions that automatically meet the specific needs of poor urban students.

George Bramley (1995) suggested that the purpose of the school indicators falls into two distinct components. The first component is a summation of a school as being either good or bad, or somewhere on the continuum in-between. The second and more

significant component is to measure the impact of implementing new school policies and, where appropriate data were maintained, to evaluate the consequence of current policy against some appropriate historical benchmark.

Levine (1990) expressed his view that the Effective School Movement and subsequent correlates are being used by numerous schools and districts to design their own Effective School Programs for improving student performance.

James Lytle (1990) clearly described the role of Effective School Research in relation to the federal government. At the reauthorization of Chapter I in 1988 (PL100-297-April 28, 1988), the language of the law specifically used terms that described the Effective School Programs as key components in accountability provisions. The components, according to Lytle, would include an extensive parent involvement provision, concentration grants, and an innovative programs provision. The Effective School Programs provision, as defined by Congress, was to mean "promoting school-level planning, instructional improvement, and staff development; increasing the academic achievement levels of all children and, particularly, educationally deprived children; and achieving as ongoing conditions in the school the . . . factors identified through effective schools research as distinguishing effective from ineffective schools" (p. 210). Lytle further stated that the House Committee on Education and Labor (1988) reviewed Effective School Research and published the 71-page review entitled, "Increasing Educational Success: The Effective Schools Model." To further strengthen the role of Effective School Research in May of 1988, the Department of Education

issued a Request for Proposals for a new center to "conduct and relate activities for the study of effective schooling of disadvantaged students."

A longitudinal study of effective versus ineffective schools by Charles Teddlie and Sam Stringfield (1993) concluded that there is a positive effect on the students beyond school. Sam Stringfield and Rebecca Herman (1997) in their work concluded that schools have a positive effect on disadvantaged students' academic achievements.

In an article by Barbara Taylor (2002), which was a defense of the Effective Schools Research movement, she briefly revisited its history and role.

> In the early 1980's the Effective School Movement produced empirical research that caught the heart of the message of 'all children can learn.' The original correlates became expanded descriptions of 'what works' in school reform. Secretary of Education William Bennett espoused the Effective School Movement, and over the decade the language of the correlates became the language of school improvement and school reform. (See "The Correlates of Effective School," p. 377). 'High expectations' or teaching all children to agree upon (state and local) standards so that they will be successful at the next grade level, site-based management for reaching consensus with faculties on 'what works,' school and classroom change strategies that address school and district mission statements, and data-guided decision making—all became part and parcel of good school reform programs (p. 376).

In a paper by Bruce Barker and Kevin Robinson (2001), in relation to effective schools and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, the authors indicated

that the role of Effective School Research and its correlates "are the means to achieving high and sustained levels of student learning. This is true regardless of gender, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. The correlates are research-based characteristics of a school's climate directly associated with improved or better student learning" (p. 4).

The Assumptions of the Effective School Correlates

In an article on the Association for Effective Schools, Inc. web site (Lezotte, 1996), there is a statement that describes the assumptions placed on the correlates. "There are unique characteristics and processes common to schools where all children are learning, regardless of family background. Because these characteristics, found in schools where all students learn, are correlated with student success-they are called correlates" (p. 1).

These correlates, as described by the Texas Education Agency (Texas Education Agency, Effective School Correlates, 2004), are: Clear and Focused School Mission, Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, High Expectations for All, the Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, Instructional Leadership, Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, and Positive Home and School Partnerships.

Clear and focused school mission. Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in Florida schools, gave a clear definition, as described by the San Diego County schools and accepted by the Florida schools. The clear and focused mission must be clearly articulated statements that are academically focused. These statements must describe high expectations, what the students are to learn, and skills to master. The authors further explained that the school district felt it

was important that the clear and focused mission must also be communicated to all staff, students, and parents. The instruction and curriculum materials must be aligned to the mission. The authors cite Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990), who described the clear and focused mission as clearly articulated with a staff that understands and is committed to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability.

Murray (1995), in a paper presented to the Eastern Educational Research Association that explained the parent perception of Effective Schools, had this definition. He shared the views of Edmonds (1979), Rosenshine (1983), Venesky and Winfield (1979), and Kemp and Hall (1992). He stated that all of these writers have identified the importance of planning, defining, prioritizing goals and objectives, and organizing content to facilitate optimal students success. He further said that Brookover and Lezotte (1979), as well as Lawrence, Baker, Hansen, and Elsi (1974), stressed the importance of appropriate curriculum planning and teacher promotion of common purpose.

Dentler's (1994) study implied that a comprehensive shared vision in his successful schools was directly related to the historical, cultural, and educational conditions. He further conjectured that all of this was directly related to the local political structure. He stated that, while the mandates from state and federal agencies are apparent, "transformative improvements in educational and related services for children hinge mainly upon local community politics, political culture, and school organization. It will matter greatly who runs for local office, who gets elected to the school board, and how these leaders choose, mandate, and then support a superintendent. . . ." (p. 25).

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995), in a review of School Effectiveness Research literature, indicated the importance of the shared vision and goals. They stated that the research clearly shows that schools that are effective build consensus on their aims and values. Collaborative work and decision-making among the stakeholders is apparent. Review of the literature by the three researchers indicated that elements such as cooperation, effective communication, and shared goals are crucial for success (Lee, Bryk, & Smith, 1993). "Most studies of effective organizations emphasize the importance of shared vision in uplifting aspirations and fostering a common purpose" (p. 11). The authors also referred to research by the late Ronald Edmonds' (1979) original work, which also concluded that importance of school-wide policies and agreement amongst teachers in their aims was necessary for success. Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore continued their review of literature with these findings: "Both School Effectiveness Research and evaluations of school improvement programs show that consensus on the values and goals of the school are associated with improved educational outcomes . . ." (p. 11). Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore also indicated that an article by Cohen (1983) showed the importance of clear, public, and agreed upon instructional goals. Further study by Cohen, according to the authors, implied that the need for curriculum and instructional programs was to be interrelated; a level of professional autonomy was important. In Effective Schools, according to Cohen, considerable autonomy to individual teachers carried less weight than the shared goals and strategies of the professional staff.

Safe and orderly environment. Robert J. Chaskin and Diana M. Rauner (1995), in a research article on caring sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, discovered that the relationship between the students and teachers is an important one in establishing a positive safe and orderly environment. The review of articles along with the research results indicated that, "interactions between teachers, students and parents often make the difference between positive school experiences and frustration and alienation" (pp. 667-668). The research of David Cohen and Deborah Lowenberg Ball (2001), indicated findings along the same lines with Chaskin and Rauner. "Although many people think of instruction as what teachers do, it consists of interactions involving teachers, students, and content. The interactions occur in such varied settings as . . ."(p.75). Cohen and Ball stress that instruction takes place in a safe and orderly environment.

Dick Corbett and Bruce Wilson (2002), in an article in which they interviewed students at an inner-city school, reviewed their findings on the importance of the teacher in relation to a safe and orderly school. "According to students, their teachers varied tremendously in how well they were able to control students, and the one who could not maintain control bothered them a lot" (p. 19). One student remarked that she wanted a teacher who was strict enough for her to learn. Another said that teachers who let students do what they want do not get the point across. She said that strict teachers get the point across.

John Holloway (2002), in a review of research articles on small class size, reported that one of the results is less discipline problems with students. He wrote that research tends to show that teachers are able to focus on individualized instruction, and

this resulted in an orderly and safe environment in which learning could take place (Stecher and Bohenstedt, 2000; Finn and Achilles, 1999). John Zahorik (1999), in his review of programs on class size reduction in three states, also shared the same view. He stated that one of the major results of reducing class size was the increase in instruction due to the lack of disciplining. He said that the research teams of Cahen, Filby, McCutchen, and Kyle (1983), Robinson and Wittebols (1986), and Johnston and Davis (1989) also reached this conclusion. He further stated that it is the belief of many researchers that this increased student achievement. In another article by Anke Halbach, Karen Ehrle, John Zahorik, and Alex Molnar (2001), in a further review of programs that are reducing class size, the results seem to indicate the benefits of a safe and orderly environment. With the reduction in class size, one of the benefits is that . . . "Teachers of smaller classes reported an overall reduction in discipline problems" (p. 32). They wrote that there are now two decades of studies which have documented greater achievement gains for students in small classes compared to larger classes. They also said that the greatest gains have been in the area of minority groups and students in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas. If the teachers are working in a safe and orderly environment, then learning is happening.

Another proponent of smaller classrooms that create a safe and orderly climate is Patricia Handley (2002). In Handley's article she shared 28 years of teaching experience in both large and small classrooms. She indicated that students have opportunities to be heard in smaller classrooms. Discussions can be held without having to raise their hand and students learn to allow classmates to finish speaking and to answer accordingly. She

said the exchange of thoughts, philosophies, and opinions become a foundation for classroom respect and regard. She commented that self-esteem rises and social interactions are more positive. The students learn the skills of compromise and consensus development. She strongly believed that in smaller classrooms students are more actively engaged, and thus fewer discipline problems arise. She ended her article with the only evidence she could gather. In the year that she had a smaller class, all of her students made at least a year's growth in all academic areas and many made even more progress than that.

Research at present seems to indicate that reduction in class size helps create the safe and orderly environment which Effective School proponents indicate is necessary. Kirk Johnson (2002), in his review of programs in California and also his review of other research data, felt there was still room for doubt:

> A consortium of researchers from RAND, the American Institute for Research (AIR), Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), EdSource, and WestEd analyzed the effect of California's class size reduction initiatives and outlined two basic problems. First, k-3 classes that remained large were concentrated in districts serving high percentages of minority, low-income, or English learner (EL) students' (Stecher and Bohrnstedt, 2000, p. 10). Second, schools serving low-income, minority, or EL students continued to have fewer well-qualified teachers than did other schools (p. 10). Clearly, if billions of dollars are to be spent on reducing class size, tangible evidence should exist that students benefit

> academically from such initiatives. As yet, evidence of the efficacy of class size reduction is mixed at best (p. 28).

Johnson's article indicated that a study by the Center for Data Analysis in which the variables of class size, race and ethnicity, parents' education, the availability of reading materials in the home, free and reduced-price lunch participation, and gender were introduced, the results according to the data were. . . . "reading assessment between students in small classes and students in large classes was statistically insignificant. That is, across the United States, students in small classes did no better on average than those in large classes, assuming otherwise identical circumstances" (p. 29.)

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in Florida schools gave a clear definition, as described by San Diego County schools and accepted by the Florida schools. In their description of this correlate, all parties are engaged in purposeful activities that are learning-related. Positive feedback, discipline policies, and encouragement are consistent. The definition also described the campus as attractive and well-kept by staff, students, and parents. Evers and Bacon emphasized the research by Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990), which stated that a safe and orderly environment of an Effective School had an atmosphere where it is businesslike and purposeful, which would be free of physical harm, threat or oppressive.

David Murray (1995) said the literature suggests (Edmonds, 1979; Rutter, 1979; and others) that every school should have a written code of conduct that defines specific and acceptable behaviors. He explained that Stringfield (1992) wrote that these standardized operating procedures are characteristic of a highly reliable organization.

Ron Banks (1997) suggested that a school without a safe and orderly environment will have negative consequences for the general school climate.

Patricia George (2000), in an article that reviewed differing programs in relation to principals as leader, also comes to the conclusion that, “Creating a safe, orderly climate that promotes student achievement and meets the individual needs of its students is a goal of every educator” (p. 3).

In a related article by Isaac Friedman (1995), there is indication that the safe and orderly climate of the school has a correlation to teacher burnout. While the author clearly expressed the view that there is not enough empirical data to date, superficially data does seem to imply that a lack of a safe and orderly climate is an indicator. Friedman referred to studies in which, “researchers have focused on the unique characteristics of situations in which teachers function, factors involved in teacher-student interactions were the primary source of stress leading to burnout” (p. 282). He quoted a study by J.J. Blase (1982) that found that teachers perceived their students as the main source of burnout in their work because of indifference, discipline problems, unsatisfactory achievement, and absenteeism. He went on to say that Mr. Blase said that teachers complained about the irksome task of having to cope with breaches of classroom and school rules. Similar findings by other researchers are shared in the article that basically expressed the same view. The author wrote that 22 articles by others on teacher anxiety indicated that classroom discipline and discipline-related problems were the primary source of stress. Other researchers, according to the author, found significant correlations between the prevalence of misbehavior and emotional exhaustion and

depersonalization of teachers. In a final remark, the author shared what L. Cohen and L. Manion (1981) discussed in their article along these same lines. They discovered that students who feel that their behaviors created stress in their teachers were more apt to continue the behaviors, thereby aggravating and exacerbating the stress level of the teacher.

In an article by Irwin Hyman and Pamela Snook (2000), these authors contended that the school safety issue is directly connected to educators' violence against the students.

> We argue that educator violence against students, including verbal and physical assaults and the undermining of student constitutional rights, erodes rather than enhances school safety. Unnecessarily harsh and punitive disciplinary practices against students create a climate that contributes to school violence (p. 489).

These authors stated that the use of metal detectors, increased police presence in schools, searches of students and lockers, and the use of staff and student identification cards have helped create this atmosphere. The article goes on to explain that the best way to reduce violence and create a safe and orderly climate is to do a climate assessment, which begins with problem identification. They contended that the school climate includes all aspects of the environment in which the school finds itself. This will include the community, parents, students, teachers, and even the school buildings. They stressed in the article to return to the democratic ideal of the fundamental belief that all have a stake in the success of the school. "We believe that the best antidote for toxic climates characterized by punitive discipline is large infusions of democracy" (p. 492).

In an interesting study by Dentler (1994), of 11 school districts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, this correlate directly impacted student learning. All the schools in his study suffered from rising rates of crime, violence, drugs, and family breakdown. One of the schools in Phoenix, in 1991, held the record for the most drive by shootings. What is interesting is the difference in the three high performing districts. These districts placed a high value on social, health, and psychological services for the students. There was also a close collaboration between the schools and the local social and health agencies and police. The community and the subsequent diverse ethnic subcommunities were invested in the schools and all participants were unified in their political determination to do what was necessary to create an atmosphere of success. This study also showed that it was not necessarily the rich schools which were a success. The involvement of all stakeholders in the schools was the factor for success, not money. A determinate factor for success was strongly influenced by the quality of teaching, health, and protective services that were offered at the school.

Jerome Freiberg (1998) stated, “A healthy school climate contributes to effective teaching and learning” (p. 22). The author went on to express the view that school climate is an ever-changing factor in the lives of the people who work and learn in school. In this article, Freiberg gave us a review of three surveys to measure school climate. The surveys used were the measurement of student concerns as a student moved from one school and/or level to another, entrance and exit interviews of students, and ambient noise in the cafeteria. All of these techniques gave a picture of the climate of the school, and thus clear indicators to guide in corrective actions. Freiberg said that

measuring school climate can help us understand what was and what is, so that we can move forward to what could be.

In an article by William Owings and Leslie Kaplan (2000), their approach to safe and orderly schools was different. "Principals and assistant principals have two primary jobs: keeping students safe and keeping them learning. Effective principals recognize the synergy in these two jobs, but it has never been more difficult to do either one" (p. 54). This article gives us many statistics showing the violence on school campuses. It also tells us that overall the statistics for fights, deaths, weapons, and student injury due to violence has decreased over the past several years. However, they also show us that suspension and expulsion rates are at an all-time high.

Owings and Kaplan wrote that Jenson (1998) expressed the view that threats of violence in the school environment may be the single greatest contributor to impaired academic learning. The article went on to explain that, due to the prevailing reaction to violence by school officials, they have built in a level of stress that is not conducive to learning. The authors stated that Jenson suggested that surveillance cameras, metal detectors, and emergency evacuation drills make students and educators feel a level of stress that is not helpful. The challenge, Jenson continued, is compounded by the very nature of today's schools. "Today's students have diverse ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds and more varied family structures, socioeconomic status, learning styles, and learning disabilities" (p. 54). The very nature of this diversity has increased the challenges to schools in the creation of safe and academic environments. The authors suggested that much of the aggression in schools results from placing students in an

environment (educationally) where they can't succeed. This lack of control and success, according to the authors, causes frustration, alienations, and anger, which in turn develop into tardiness, truancy, and aggressive actions. They further stated that students who are academically and socially competent feel that they are in control of their lives. The article went on to suggest ways of changing the school environment. In conclusion, they said that a synergy exists between a safe school and a positive learning climate. They further remarked that the principal knows that keeping students safe and increasing learning are connected.

In a related article, Mary Fenley (1993) stressed the need for a safe and orderly environment. In her article, she reviewed several successful programs that were being offered around the country. Within the framework of the programs was the need for the schools and communities to work effectively together:

> Each community must assess its own needs and adapt the framework to its own characteristics. The underlying causes of violence vary from community to community . . . Deeply imbedded cultural problems such as racism, sexism, poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, drug trafficking, and frequent exposure to violence are but a few of the important pieces of this complicated puzzle (p. 9).

She also indicated that students who are high risk of violent behavior are those that consistently engage in physical fights to resolve problems, those with criminal records, those with a history of violent injury, drug users, gang members, and those who have failed or dropped out of school. Migrants and immigrants and youth who are highly mobile are also others who are prone to violence. The many programs that are successful

indicate that it is because of the work of the communities and schools standing together. The article ends with a 37-page chart of community programs designed to prevent youth violence.

In a survey by Vicente Paredes (1992) in which he analyzed data from three instruments on school climate, the findings indicated that school climate was a variable that was most highly related to student achievement. The data also suggested that in schools where there was a positive school climate, there was also a high rate of leaning and lower dropout rate.

Royal Van Horn (1999) in an article where the discussion was about the multiple-variables of inner-city schools, the school climate correlate was approached:

> The climate of a school is an important concept in its own right. The extent to which the school atmosphere promotes openness, colleagueship, professionalism, trust, loyalty, commitment, pride, academic excellence, and cooperation is critical in developing a healthy work environment for teachers and administrators (p. 294).

The author stressed the importance of school climate and as an indicator of the mental health of a school. The author also shared the results of a ten-year study by Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp in relation to the teachers:

> Over a period of about 10 years the authors developed, validated, and normed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) for both elementary and secondary schools. One of the most interesting aspects of the climate profile is the 'disengaged teacher behavior' variable. This variable is in most instances

> the strongest predictor of school climate. Disengaged Behavior refers to a lack of meaning and focus to professional activities. Teachers are simply putting in time and are nonproductive in group efforts or team building; they have no common goals. Their behavior is often negative and critical of their colleagues and the organization (p. 294).

Horn commented that this was another important variable in relation to school climate.

High expectations and achievement of all. In an article by Doris Sperling (1993) in which she discussed "what's worth an A?" she explained her dilemma with establishing criteria for setting high expectations. Her struggle to create assessments that clearly defined this correlate was brought to bear with a wonderful quote by one of her students, "What do you mean by better?"

Evers and Bacon (1994) in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools gave, a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools and accepted by the Florida schools. High expectations and achievement of all is a school-wide belief structure. The school district stresses that the teachers and staff must believe that all students can obtain mastery of skills taught. The district believes that the school should use heterogeneous groupings, direct instruction, peer tutoring, cooperative learning groups, and team learning to ensure this mastery. Learning should be celebrated regularly through displays of student and staff work, awards assemblies, and other public acknowledgements. The authors cited Lezotte (1990), and Bullard and Taylor (1993), as defining high expectations as an atmosphere

where the staff believes in mastery by the student and that they can teach to this level of mastery.

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995), in an exhaustive review on the characteristics of Effective Schools, had much to say on this correlate. In their review, they stressed that by this date there are many studies and articles. The data seem to indicate that an Effective School will be characterized by the desire to promote academic excellence and is emphasized by the teachers and pupils (McKill and Rigsby, 1973; Weber, 1971; Mortimore et al., 1988a; Ainsworth and Batten, 1974; Rutter et al., 1979).

In a review of articles in relation to high achievement and high expectations by Gerald Bracey (2002), the author came to this conclusion. In a study of the results of two schools in the same neighborhood, but which had differing results, the data indicated that the school with academic success was due to:

> Roosevelt teachers created an environment that was highly supportive of student learning. They acted as coaches, guiding students and structuring the task in a way that demonstrated their own investment in having students reach this goal ... This support ultimately helped students believe that reaching the test-score cutoffs was an attainable and important goal (p. 432).

In a study by Dentler (1994), of 11 public school districts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, the correlate on high expectation was discussed. In all three of the high performing districts the teachers, "communicated higher academic expectations to their students; believe all students can learn, recognize and reward their students symbolically more often and take pride in their own instructional successes" (pp. 17-18).

Marge Scherer (2002) interviewed Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, author of *Becoming Adult: How Teenagers Prepare for the World of Work.* In Csikszentmihalyi's survey work of 1,000 students and over 30,000 written reports by these students, an interesting result was discovered. In a question, which basically was asking the students about high expectation and achievement for all on standardized test, the results were interesting. The survey results given by the students indicated that expectations for a test needed to be clear and understandable and that they were less stressful if they were.

Eliot Levine (2002) discussed high expectation and its role in a small urban school in Providence, Rhode Island. The school is referred to as the 'Met.' In comparing the Met to the other Providence schools, the statistics are very promising:

> The Met has one-third the absentee rate, one-third the dropout rate, and one-eighteenth the suspension rate of other Providence public high schools. Every Met graduate has been accepted to college, even though more than half of them will be the first in their families to attend college (p. 29).

The author said that personal relationships, high expectations, and high standards provide the context for learning. The Met has five common learning goals that students must learn and it is within these goals and the high expectations of the success of the goals that has produced the success of this program. The five common learning goals are: Empirical reasoning: The goal is to think like a scientist - to use empirical evidence and a logical process to make decisions and to evaluate hypotheses. Quantitative reasoning: The goal is to think like a mathematician- to understand numbers, to analyze uncertainty, to comprehend the properties of shapes, and to study how things change

over time. Communication: The goal is to be a great communicator - to understand your audience; to use technology and artistic expression to communicate; and to be exposed to another language. Social reasoning: The goal is to think like an historian or anthropologist - to see diverse perspectives, to understand social issues, to explore ethics, and to look at issues historically. Personal Qualities: The goal is to be the best you can be - to demonstrate respect, responsibility, organization, and leadership; to reflect on your abilities; and to strive for improvement. The writer also said there is a strong working relationship between the school and parents. Levine shared a recent survey by the Rhode Island Department of Education (1999), in which it indicated that 98% of the parents agreed that the school viewed them as important.

Donald Gratz (2000), in his article on expectation related to standards, made the statement that, "All children can live up to much higher expectations and most will" (p. 682). Where we seem to weaken is in our resolve. He quoted Judy Codding and Marc Tucker:

> One of the most striking features of countries that are more successful than we in educating their students to high standards is the assumption made by parents, teachers, and the student themselves that the students can do it. By contrast, the most important obstacle to high student achievement in the United States is our low expectations for students - not just students who are poor and come from minority backgrounds, but . . . most of our students (p. 682).

In another article on high expectations for students, the author Beverly Tatum (2000) discussed her results of a two-year project that addressed racism. The project,

which was funded by the Carnegie Corporation, had three components - an after-school cultural-identity-group, parent outreach workshops, and professional development courses for educators. The author designed the professional development portion of the project and the article is primarily about those results. She indicated the project was needed due to the increase of racial intolerance and hostility at all age levels. She also indicated that in the United States most teachers are white and were raised and educated in predominantly white communities; thus, they are limited to their understanding of children of color. She strongly recommended multicultural-education courses or programs. In her review of the white teachers who took her program, the underlying assumption by most of the whites were that children of color could not make the rigorous educational expectations. It was through this program and the discovery and open communication between teachers and students that showed this was not true.

Time on task. In an article by Gordon Cawelti (2000), which reviewed the success of a minority school in south Texas, the data clearly indicated that, "Many children simply need more time than others to master basic skills" (p. 43). The TAAS results in Reading for 1998 showed a passing rate of 90.7% and all students passed the Writing test above the state average of 85.3%. The Math results indicated that 97.3% passed.

John Zahorik (1999), in an article that reviewed research on class size reduction, indicated that one of the main benefits of this process is to increase time on task. With smaller classes, the teachers are able to focus on an individual's needs. The author stressed that the main result of more instructional time, knowledge of students, and

teacher enthusiasm is individualization. Often the individualization is one-to-one tutoring, but it also occurs in other ways. Zahorik went on to write that teachers individualize when they form and instruct small groups on the basis of perceived need. He indicated teachers individualize during whole-class instruction when they provide numerous opportunities for each student to express his or her understanding.

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools gave, a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools, which was accepted by the Florida schools. In Effective Schools time, on task is critical to the learning process. The district defines this as well-designed classroom operating procedures, the use of adequate time allocated for basic skills instruction, opportunities to respond, and proper use of homework. The authors cited Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990) as explaining time on task as allocation of significant amounts of classroom time, which would be dedicated to whole or large group instruction. This instruction would be teacher-directed and planned.

Laraine Hong (2001), in an article related to time on task, indicated its importance to an Effective School. This author went on to express the view that was one of the major reasons she retired early:

> It is difficult to believe that any school district could be unaware of how time undergirds effective instruction. Yet, ironically, in responding to the pressure of standards and high-stakes assessments, additional directives from the central office to schools and teachers are proliferating, often intruding on instructional time and undermining teaching and learning (p. 712).

In her article she referred to this time on task dilemma as, ‘New Expectations Same Old Schedule,’ and went on to share a day-to-day schedule of events that either distracted from teaching or limited the teacher’s ability to teach.

In an interesting article by Clifford Janey (2002), the time on task correlate is viewed entirely different. The article is about a new direction by the Rochester City School District and time needed for graduation. It suggests that we hold time constant and vary the quality of learning; while their approach suggests that we hold quality of learning constant and vary the time. Through this new approach, the high school students may enter into a pathway that will allow them to move through the school year at their own pace, and thus graduate on their own time-line.

D’Amico (2001), in his study on the achievement gap of minorities, indicated that research shows the need for smaller classrooms so the teachers will have more time on task. D’Amico indicated that several researchers (Howley, 2001; Pritchard, 1999; Stiefel et al., 2000; North Carolina Public School, 2000) recommend that reducing the number of students in school or classrooms will enable teachers more time with students, and thus increase academic learning.

Bruce Biddle and David Berliner (2002) warned that class size is, “not a panacea for education” (p. 16). In their article they shared differing views about class size and its results on minority students. While the American Federation of Teachers asserts that there is compelling evidence that class reduction will have a positive effect on student achievement in relation to time on task, the authors shared that the Heritage Foundation

and their research teams have a divergent view and did not agree with the findings of the American Federation of Teachers.

Principal as instructional leader. A paper by Ruth Ash and Maurice Persall (2004), both professors at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, discussed the idea that the modern principal is the Chief Learning Officer. In the paper, the two professors stressed the importance of the new direction of the local school principal. They suggested that in this new era of education, the building principal will enhance the quality of thinking of those within the organization rather than edicts or directives. They wrote that this will be possible by creating learning opportunities that will enable the staff and the faculty to become leaders themselves. The authors then go on to say that the old adage of, 'Doing things right,' rather than, 'Doing the right thing,' will be more highly valued. They do stress, however, that at the present time most of our modern schools were designed instructionally and managerially in the nineteenth century. "The schools of yesterday and today are not the kind of schools we need for tomorrow" (p. 2). In a slight twist to the Deming direction of management, the two professors listed the following as important functions of an effective principal for the new schools of tomorrow. They suggested that the modern formative leader will: Create team learning, productive thinking, and collaborative problem solving; teachers will be viewed as leaders and school principals as leaders of leaders; trust should drive working relationships and the job of the leader will be to drive out fear; leaders will move from demanding conformity and compliance to encouraging and supporting innovation and creativity; the leader will focus on people and processes; leaders will be customer-

focused and servant-based; leaders will create networks that foster two-way communication; formative leadership will require proximity, visibility, and being close to the customer; leaders will empower the people within the school to do the work without interference; and, finally, the leader will be able to operate in an environment of uncertainty, constantly learning how to exploit systemic change, rather than maintaining the status quo. Later in the article, they quoted Stanley Davis from his book *2001 Management*. This quote is very important as we review the Effective School principal, "Many years ago I asked an executive responsible for the future development of a very large corporation, What do you worry about most on your job?" His answer was startling, "I worry most about what my people don't know they don't know. What they know they don't know they're able to work on and find the answer to. But they can't do that if they don't know they don't know." The authors went on to express their view that the principal of the future will need to be able to approach the future by understanding predictions and scenario planning. The effective instructional leader will need to be aware of emerging trends in society in order to structure curricular and instructional strategies that will properly prepare students.

Michael Fullan (2002) expressed the view that, "Characterizing instructional leadership as the principal's central role has been a valuable first step in increasing student learning" (p. 17). However, he went on to stress that we have not gone far enough. He says that our effective leaders must be able to change the learning cultures of schools and transform the teaching profession itself. He accepts that the best examples of success are represented by the accomplishments at the effective level-high

performance standards with corresponding results. He expressed the belief that they do not go deep enough and that only lasting reforms implemented by the executive leaders will create enduring greatness. He goes on to say that creating and sharing knowledge is central to effective leadership, but then strongly suggests that within the cultures of change the leader must be committed to develop and share that knowledge. "An organization cannot flourish-at least, not for long-on the actions of the top leader alone. Schools and districts need many leaders at many levels" (p. 19).

John Evers and Trudy Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in relation to the principal, gave a clear definition, as described by the San Diego County Schools. In Effective Schools, principals will demonstrate strong leadership in: curriculum and instruction, communication of the mission and goals, monitoring of progress of both pupils and programs, setting high expectations for students and staff, protecting instructional time, proper use of the skills of the teaching staff, and plans for staff growth and development. The authors indicated that the researchers Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990) all wrote that the principal in an Effective School will persistently communicate the mission to parents, staff, and students. These three authors also said that application of the characteristics of instructional effectiveness and management of instructional programs will also be observable.

Larry Lashway (2000), in a recent review of articles about effective principals, said that traditionally principals have been accountable for doing their jobs well. He went on to suggest that in the past principals were responsible for treating teachers fairly,

listening to parents, exercising instructional leadership, and staying within the budget. The present is demanding not only the above, but also high student achievement. Lashway further contended that the new principals will need to balance autonomy and central authority issues. The new direction will need to be facilitative rather than directive. The instructional leader will also need to understand the two environments in which student performance thrives: classroom environment (student teacher interaction) and successful instructional strategies (organization). The principal as the instructional leader will need to allow the teacher the flexibility to interact with students, establish unique teaching atmospheres, while at the same time guiding the instructional direction of the school. He found in another study that the principal will need to model leadership that embodies an explicit attempt to overcome the isolation of the teachers by recruiting the teacher into direct involvement in the life of the school. He suggested that in today's current atmosphere, the principal must carve out a leadership style. "The principal can also provide a strong leadership role by acting as the conscience of the school" (p. 11). He further explained that to do this, the principal will have to bring into account all the particular nuances of his school. He will need to blend history, personalities, community contexts, and organizational cultures to make all of the above successful.

Owings and Kaplan (2000) suggested that a major responsibility of the principal as instructional leader is to increase student ownership and investment in their schoolwork. He said that Hill and Crevola (1999) explain this is done by teachers using research-supported instructional best practices that actively engage all students in the learning process. What Darling-Hammond (1999) and Wasley (1999) referred to as the

teachers' repertoire of teaching techniques: ongoing instructionally-focused professional development activities, frequent classroom observations, and teacher conferences.

John Keedy (1992), in a case study of Nottingham High School and its principal, indicated that principals are "critical to school success" (p. 2). In his case study, he remarked that there is a lack of knowledge in reference to the characterization of the principalship. He even suggested that this lack of knowledge has made some observers question whether educational administration is a profession, "since we lack a codified body of knowledge" (p. 2). He went on to say that researchers such as Guthrie, Clifford, and Colbertson have all remarked on the lack of codified knowledge. Keedy's study revealed two significant areas that seem to indicate a successful principal. One area is that the principal have the reputation for turning a school around during his tenure and the other is a significant increase in student outcomes. In the study, he also indicated a successful principal will be able to communicate the vision and mission of the school. Keedy also said that the principals' mission and vision at Nottingham were different from each other. He suggested that writers such as Goldman, Dunlap, and Conley have appeared to use mission and vision, interchangeably, but that the principal at Nottingham kept the two separated. Keedy said that the sense of mission helped the principal survive and his sense of vision evolved as the act of "translating opportunities" (p. 17).

Dorren Schmitt (1990), who presented a paper to the Annual Meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators in New Orleans, discovered research that seemed to imply much of what Guthrie, Clifford and Colbertson indicated in the 1992 Keedy study. Schmitt remarked that two researchers, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) discovered after a

three-year study of California schools that the very nature and differences of public schools require a highly diversified and changeable instructional leader. They contended that, "there should not be one set of standards for an effective instructional leadership" (p. 10).

Richard DuFour (2002) stated that, "Educators are gradually redefining the role of the principal from instructional leaders with a focus on teaching to the leader of a professional community with a focus on learning" (p. 15). He stressed that the instructional leader of the past concentrated on learning and its inputs on the process itself. He said the new leader focuses on school community and outcomes. He ended his article with the statements that principals should be leaders who promote student and teacher learning.

Frequent monitoring. Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools, gave a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools, which was accepted by the Florida schools. Effective Schools will frequently assess student progress. The school district says this will be done by the teachers informing students and their parents about objectives and mastery of course contents. This process will be used to improve programs and alter teaching strategies when necessary. The district stresses that there be congruence between the objectives of the school's curriculum, what teachers are actually teaching, and the tests that are used to assess the programs. The authors stated that Lezotte (1990) and Bullard and Taylor (1993) suggested that an Effective School will use a variety of

assessment procedures frequently. The results of this data will then be used to improve the instructional program.

In his 1995 survey, Murray found that monitoring of student progress was essential for student success. He remarked that it was closely aligned to curricular issues. He suggested that teachers should match the pre-defined objectives with student performance. The teachers should take the results of assessments as a way to monitor their instructional methods. He further shared that several researchers (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Cohen, 1981; Evertson, 1982) all shared the view that this was an important Effective School Correlate. Two other researchers, cited in the Murray article, Meyers and Carlson (1992) suggested that student performance and alignment between the test and curriculum should be done in a systematic way.

Positive home and school partnerships. Joyce L. Epstein (1995), in an article on schools, family, and community partnerships, came to this conclusion, "The way schools care about children is reflected in the way schools care about the children's families" (p. 701). While she stressed in her article there are many reasons to have school and family partnerships, the main reason is to create a successful relationship that will help youngsters succeed.

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools, gave a clear definition, as described by the San Diego County Schools, which was accepted by the Florida schools. The Effective School will have the community and the parents understanding and actively supporting the purpose of the school. The school will have many opportunities for interaction of the parents to

support their children's learning at home and at school. There will be clear and open communication about objectives, course content, student progress, and other school programs. The district stresses in its definition that there will be opportunities for teachers and parents to meet together. Parent-teacher conferences, class meetings, and volunteer programs will be evident in an Effective School. They end their definition stressing that all parties will realize the importance of this process to the students, parents, and administration and will actively participate in goal setting and planning to make this possible.

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995, in their review of Effective School Research and its correlates, clearly indicated the importance of this home and school partnership. The authors indicated that Coleman and others in their research have shown the benefits of schools working with parents and parental involvements in their children's learning. The authors go on to share that Armor and others (1976) showed that parental presence in school and their participation in committees, events, and other activities all had a positive effect on achievement. At the same time, they also shared that Brookover and Lezotte (1979) found no support for a relationship between parental involvement and effectiveness. The authors also cited a study of junior high schools by Mortimore and others (1988a). These researchers found positive benefits where parents helped in the classrooms and with school trips and meetings. Tizard and others (1982) showed that parents who help with their child's reading were more effective than an extra teacher in the classroom. The authors go on to suggest that the actual mechanisms by which parents may be involved and how this influences school effectiveness are still

not entirely clear. It is suggested by the data that if the parents and teachers have similar objectives and expectations for the students, this can be a powerful force for success.

Murray (1995), in his study of South Carolina Schools, made this blanket statement about parental and community involvement:

> It has been known for a long time that parent involvement, particularly in support of the instructional program, strengthens success among their children. Effective School literature suggests that procedures for involvement must be clearly communicated and information related to helping children with learning should be provided. Brookover (1978), Levin (1982), and Wildson (1981) are among the contributors to this literature. Helping with homework is also an integral part of this correlate (p. 3).

In Murray's study the parents strongly perceived this to be an important correlate.

In a study by D'Amico (2001), he reviewed data on the achievement gap of minorities in schools. The consensus of schools that were narrowing the gap was in the development of a school community. "These are racially and economically diverse schools where staff and parents see high standards and achievement as the principal school goals" (p. 4). He further stated where schools and parents worked together, the students moved toward higher achievement and chose to take harder and more challenging classes. This was due, he believes, directly to parents and teachers working together.

Jerome Stiller and Richard Ryan (1992), in a questionnaire to seventh-graders that examined the relationship of student perceptions of parents and teachers'

involvement, indicated that there was a fundamental belief that teacher and parent involvement are primary predictors of academic achievement. "It is clear that teachers provide a direct link between student assimilation of their classroom context and subsequent academic outcomes" (p. 117). The survey showed parents are also predictors of this process. The result of this study indicated that each aspect of the adult social context has unique and cumulative effects. The authors found that, while teachers may most directly impact how the student experiences school, parents have an additional and important bearing on student experience. The authors went on to predict that an academic environment experienced by the student with the support of the other groups will be a predictor to competence-oriented learning.

In a related article by Shelley Billig (2000), there is growing evidence for service-learning. She cited studies by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, who over a decade earlier, had suggested that there was a growing trend toward service-learning K-12 within the reform of education. She said that the authors indicated that there was growing understanding that young people seemed to be growing increasingly alienated from communities and from society. Because of this alienation, it was thought that this was the reason young people were less likely to volunteer and also the reason for decline in test scores in school. While service-learning was still unproven as an educational approach, she says the two authors concluded, "the case for community service as a legitimate educational practice receives provisional support from quantitative, quasi-experimental studies and even more consistent affirmation from the reports and testimony of participants and practitioners" (p. 661).

Arnold Fege (2000), in an article on parental roles within the schools, expressed the view that the modern parents' role in school is changing. He stated that with the results-oriented curriculum with accountability for learning means that parents become a strategic instructional resource for the school. He warned school leaders that they can no longer see parents as appendages to schooling. He said more and more parents see themselves as "purchasers of public education with a right to demand from schools individualized services" (p. 39). With the speed of the internet, parents can now practice a form of direct democracy. They can talk to parents around the district, around the state, and around the country. He stressed that parents must be given more direct involvement. Schools will need to upgrade their ability to communicate with parents. He sees at present . . . "21st century families attempting to partner with 20th century school organizations" (p. 49). He strongly suggested that efforts to improve children's academic outcomes are more effective if they encompass families. A November 1999 national poll by Peter D. Hart Research Associates for Public Education Network revealed some interesting data about families: 89% of the respondents identified schools that provide a quality education as a very important community priority, 85% favored community involvement in schools over vouchers, 47% said that time was a barrier to participation at school, and 48% said they were not given the opportunity to be involved. The writer warned in the article that the data indicated there was a large untapped market of support that if the public schools do not approach, the private sectors will.

In a related article by Andy Hargreaves and Dean Fink (2000), who reviewed the results of two high schools in Ontario, Canada, their findings were interesting. Both

schools were specialized for size, cost, leadership, staff recruitment, and retention. Where one school became successful and the other did not was in its ability to communicate with the community and parents. The writers indicated that . . . "In innovative settings, professional images of a good school are often at odds with the community's notion of a real school" (p. 31). They suggested that the educational battle against poverty, disadvantage, and racial inequality involves making broad connections with families and dramatic changes to the structure and the curriculum of schools. The authors went on to stress that in the end, educators would do better to capture the public imagination on which governments depend by making their practice and improvement efforts highly visible and by helping create a broad social movement for large-scale, deep, and sustainable transformations in public education that will benefit all students.

The Limitations of the Effective School Correlates

Dantley (1990) rather strongly indicted the Effective School movement as, "a rather simplistic regimen and reveals a systematic autism which fails to take into consideration the social and economic realities in which urban poor schools and students find themselves" (p. 585). He said further that as a result of the movement's "rather limited perspective of schools, the multidimensional aspects of organizations, schools, and leadership frequently are ignored" (p. 585).

In his article on school diversification, Ron Brandt (2002), the Executive Editor Emeritus of *Education Leadership*, strongly objects to imposing a particular brand of education on every public school and its students.

Educators face the difficult task of altering existing school models that offer diplomas within the confines of alternative school programs (Groth, 1998). These educators attempt to create alternative programs by adapting the current policies and curriculum needed to satisfy the student's academic needs. The author further stated that the task to meet the alternative challenge is made more difficult by trying to stay within these existing educational systems.

Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) expressed the idea that educators have a basic understanding about what makes an effective school. They also contended that the use of Effective School Correlates might be applied to at-risk youth programs. They suggested and cautioned, however, that within the use of these techniques there might be a danger. The writer's concerns were that the Effective Schools movement itself might be construed as a threat to at-risk youth if there are not sufficient accommodations for the special needs of these particular students.

Stringfield (1997) questioned the ability of the Effective Schools programs to address the unique needs of the educationally disadvantaged.

Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998) suggested that attempts to achieve greater school effectiveness must address both expressive and instrumental elements of school life. They further said that specific school attributes matter most and that the dynamics of the school process itself need to be alterable.

Lytle (1990) suggested that school improvement in its present form is considered a matter of modifying staffing, policy, and resource allocations. This author further suggested that none of the advocates of improvement entertains the possibility that, as

currently organized, the school might be inappropriate for educating disadvantaged students.

Sammons (1999) remarked that the effects of Effective School Correlates to at-risk programs are very damaging to schools and their outcomes. With the strong belief in the key characteristics of Effective Schools, inspectors and other professionals (in Great Britain) who are auditing the at-risk programs, according to this author, may judge schools against what they consider best practice. School inspectors and auditors often refer to the Effective School Research explicitly and the author warned that this view is unreliable application of the Correlates.

Tom Corcoran, Susan Fuhrman, and Catherine Belcher (2001), in a review of three districts, attempts at instructional improvement came to this conclusion. They suggested that the limitations of the districts to improve were due in part to their lack of processes as to what to change. The districts seldom, "considered how teachers viewed the cost and benefits of new programs, and they rarely developed comprehensive marketing campaigns to persuade staff members to adopt new practices" (p. 83). The authors stressed that in most cases the districts simply mandated reform.

Richard Elmore and Susan Fuhrman (2001), in a review of a study done by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, indicates that different schools respond differently to the high stakes of reform. The results of the survey as reviewed by the authors imply that low-capacity, low-performing schools often do not respond to student- and school-level consequences by improving their instruction. Instead, the authors said

the schools simply continue to do the same things they were doing only doing them harder.

Linda M. McNeil's (2000) research indicated a concern with the Effective School movement as it is applied to all students. She stated that there is a growing inequality between the quality of education provided for advantaged students and students with less advantage.

Donald Thomas and William Bainbridge (2001) suggested that there are five "fallacies" being perpetuated about the Effective School movement and their Correlates through lectures and articles. These fallacies include: 1) all children can learn, 2) the principal is the instructional leader, 3) setting standards by exceptions, 4) uniform academic standards for all children, and 5) teachers must work smarter and not harder. These authors also shared the view that uniform application of the Effective School Correlates has created a major concern among some educational researchers.

Although Barbara O. Taylor (2002) defended the Effective School Correlates and their process, she admitted that research has shown the performance of school districts in large urban settings using the Effective School Correlates had not changed.

The accumulated knowledge of alternative programs for young people seems to substantiate the research on Effective Schools. The differences lie principally with goals and purposes of this specific type of education (Edmonds, 1979).

Groth (1998) and Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998) strongly suggested that applying the Effective School Research to alternative education formulas, though difficult, is possible through alteration. However, Groth (1998) was also concerned

about the danger of applying the Effective School best practices when these highly specialized schools have little control over outcomes.

Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) had grave concerns over Effective School Research in reference to definition and the restricted and inappropriate range of the outcomes. The authors contended that the research is limited due to the absence of longitudinal data and is characterized by unsupported assumptions and a lack of good modeling.

In a paper by Eubanks and Parish (1992), which was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA, the authors contended that it is difficult to discover any widespread, fundamental, or substantive change in schooling outcomes as a result of Effective Schools. They gave as examples the Kansas City Effective School ongoing project where, after five years and 18 schools, modest-to-good improvement has been the student outcome. They further contended that a major limitation to the model is looking at the outcome. In Kansas City there was modest-to-good improvement across the board. While the lowest quartile improved the most all quartiles improve, the authors show that the improvement is along race and class lines. They further expressed the belief that in several other school districts across the country where the Effective Schools model has been implemented (New York, Milwaukee, and Chicago), the results are similar. They conjectured that the strongest correlation for achievement on test scores is social class. The Coleman Studies (1966) established this social class, racial, and gender correlation. They went on to say that even today, test publishing companies now publish data that allow school districts to

compare their outcomes with school districts of similar school populations. This data, they contended, clearly establish class, race, and gender correlations with test results.

Evers and Bacon (1994), reminded us in their study that their findings were limited. Their study showed that while there is a correlational understanding, there is still no causal aspect. While in the study the teachers and staff could identify the components of the Effective Schools, they could not describe how schools are able to become effective. The study also showed that portions of the correlates were vague even with the content descriptors within the questionnaire. Terms such as Safe and Orderly Environment were open to different interpretations by different people. The authors stressed that further study is needed.

George Bramley (1995), in his survey work, also came to the conclusion that school effectiveness has many definitions, which he feels,] is in part due to various social groups and their understandings of what the correlates do or do not mean.

Margaret Goertz (2001), in an article about the limitations of communication and redefining government's roles, indicated the confusion over the definition of success. In a Congressionally mandated review, the author said that the panel concluded that due to the variability and flexibility of the differing states and districts to understand success. What might be deemed success in one school, according to the Congressional review, may be considered low-performing in another. The review further contended that the more states give districts discretion, the greater the variations in local policy and practice.

The very act of narrowing the reform of the modern school in relation to assessment is also a limitation. According to Joan L. Herman (1992), who completed a

review of research in relation to assessments and its impact on low-performing students, the research indicated that this narrowing will impact schools serving at-risk and disadvantaged students.

D'Amico (2001), in his review of the educational success of minorities, indicated that since 1988 there has been a reversal of the trends of success. While the Effective School Research continually communicates the fundamental belief of Edmonds, Lezotte, and others, this author does not agree:

> Among the many socio-cultural correlates and hypothesized causes of the achievement gap, some researchers have zeroed in on those that have been in the literature for decades. Chief among these is poverty, which researchers like Arroyo and colleagues (1999) and Bracey (1999) have noted is still a very strong predictor of low achievement in school. Weston (2000) concurs with this assessment and goes on to suggest that minority status in combination with poverty strengthens the correlation (p. 2).

In another area that clearly moves from the Effective School Correlates, the author stated that other studies have shown a school correlation to a lack of success. "Caldas and Bankston (1997; 1998) saw this situation and its negative effect on achievement as being even more prevalent in schools where there are high concentrations of students who are both minority and poor" (p. 3). Another interesting area of study that the author brings out is in cultural identification. He refers to many studies by researchers (Settlemyer, 2000; Singham, 1998; Viadero, 2000b; and Cook and Jens, 1998), which showed evidence that minority students may maintain low levels of school

achievement purposely to avoid acting white" (p. 3). D'Amico ended his paper with the statement espoused by many researchers. He stressed that after looking at years of data and correlating the achievement gap, it is apparent (by this writer) that we should . . . "stop investing in, encouraging, and mandating one-size fits-all programs without seeing whether they will have an impact on specific student needs" (p. 7). He indicated that research data showed that success in school and even later in life may very well have a direct correlation to their race and ethnicity.

In a strong article by Gerald W. Bracey (1999), a research psychologist, he responded to research and articles that seem to imply that poverty is no excuse for a lack of success. In his article he cites researchers Kevin Payne and Bruce Biddle who have done extensive research in the field of wealth and educational success in public schools. The author quoted the two researches as saying:

> If American math achievement scores had been generated only by well-funded schools in districts with low levels of poverty, the United States would have earned an aggregate achievement score slightly better than the second-ranked nation in the study, the Netherlands. In contrast, had our country been represented only by miserably funded schools in high-poverty districts, our aggregate achievement scores would have been below those of other industrialized nations, studied and nearly on a par with those of Nigeria and Swaziland (p. 330).

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1999), in their review of School Effectiveness Research, had this to say in their conclusion:

> The majority of effectiveness studies have focused exclusively on students' cognitive outcomes in areas such as reading, mathematics, or public examination results. Only a relatively few (mainly British) studies have paid attention to social/affective outcomes (e.g., Reynold, 1976; Rutter, 1979; Mortimore et al., 1988a; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993). Because of this focus, the results of our review, inevitably, tell us more about the correlates of academic effectiveness. As Reynolds (1994) had observed, we have less evidence about school and classroom processes that are important in determining school success in promoting social or affective outcomes such as behavior, attendance, attitudes, and self-esteem (p. 23).

These researchers went on to stress the need for further study and research in the areas of student motivation and commitment to school. While they feel identifying the Correlates of Effective Schools is important, the affective areas of self-esteem, attendance, and attitudes are just as important.

In an older article by Garrett Mandeville (1986), his conclusion about the limitations of Effective Schools was stressed when he said, "it is an understatement to say that there are many unresolved questions surrounding the identification of Effective Schools. Various approaches based on absolute gains, trends, and regression methods tend to produce inconsistent results and different regression-based methodologies do not even agree" (p. 6).

In a study by Evers and Bacon (1994) and the subsequent data desegregation of the questionnaire in reference to the Effective School Correlates, they determined that there was a clear difference in perceptions as to the understanding of the correlates:

> A limitation to this study is that findings are correlative and not causal. Being able to accurately describe the components of effective schools does not mean that one is able to describe how schools are able to become effective. Terms such as Safe and Orderly Environment are vague even with the content descriptors that are being used in this study. The Correlates of an Effective School are open to different interpretations by different people (p. 8).

Thomas and Bainbridge (2001) wrote an article in which they described the 'fallacies' of Effective Schools Research. The authors contended that it is a fallacy that all children can learn—at the same level and in the same amount of time. They further stated that all children can learn, at some level, and most children, as Ronald Edmonds wrote, can learn the basic curriculum if sufficient resources are provided. "The fallacy, however, is the belief that all children can learn the same curriculum, in the same amount of time, and at the same level" (p. 661). They also shared the idea about brain development and the lack of proper nutrition in young children in homes of poverty:

> Research in cognitive brain development shows that formation of synaptic contacts in the human cerebral cortex occurs between birth and age 10 (Peter Huttenlocher and Arun Dabholkar, 1997), and most of the brain gets built within a few years after birth. Environment matters greatly in brain development. . . . Brains that do not get enough protein and stimulation in their environments lose

> connections, and some potential neural pathways are shut down (John T. Bruer, 1999). These facts help to explain what educators have long observed: children from impoverished environments, in which they do not receive good nutrition and stimulating experiences, generally achieve at lower levels than children from more enriching environments (p. 661).

They continued their review of Effective School Research and ended with a remarkable quote by Edmund Burke, "The equal treatment of unequals is the greatest injustice of all."

Taylor (2002), in an article defending the Effective School Research, and thus the Correlates did however concede that there has been a movement away from the original direction of the research. "Unfortunately, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, educators who were formerly advocates of the comprehensive Effective Schools Process broke off certain elements of that process and overemphasized them, to the detriment of the whole process" (p. 377). She then goes on to mention William Spady, and his outcomes based education (OBE) program and Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools Projects, which have been accepted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, and others. She stated there are some who overemphasized leadership. She even went on to say at one point that, "due to the work carried out by such consultants is the reason Thomas and Bainbridge felt that the Effective Schools movement has been contaminated. Perhaps they are correct in a narrow sense" (p. 376).

A study in England by Bramley (1995) gave conclusions that indicate the limitations of the Correlates and Effective School Research. After an exhaustive study,

he concluded that school performance indicators have always existed, but at present there are no holistic theories of education to assist in their selection. He further stated that, while the overall aim of schools is to achieve equity through excellence, there is no stable definition as to what that might mean. He stressed that with the input of parental choice or 'parental engineering' excellence becomes a comparative concept. He also said his survey and study seemed to indicate that the very concept of school effectiveness needed to be clarified. He said that there were two possible directions for definition. One can be defined with the context of free-market economics and the second can be defined by reference to concept of equity. While the first can be understood within the confines of a free-market metaphor, he suggested that this requires a clear understanding by the parents of what the free-market metaphor actually entailed. The definition of equity was also confusing because of personal beliefs of the teachers and the parents.

Allan Odden (2000) discussed the limitations of Effective Schools from the practical view of finance. In his article, he said that sustaining fundamental educational change will be difficult and very complicated. He tells us that the act of reform of education in the 1970s and 1980s, while difficult, became even more so during implementation because of the cost factors. He said that while school reform is growing:

> One of the most problematic issues raised in comprehensive school change has to do with cost. Most discussions of comprehensive school reform seem to assume that such reform can be implemented with little if any new funds. Underlying the idea of comprehensive school reform is the notion of using existing resources differently. But it is not clear whether schools need additional money to

> implement comprehensive school changes or whether existing fund, if reallocated, could cover the cost (p. 434).

In an article by McNeil (2000) she expressed her concerns, as an educator, with the limiting factors of disaggregation of school-level scores by race. She felt that in an attempt to promote equity, local schools had replaced the regular curriculum in minority students' classrooms with test-prep materials, and thus had produced classes with little value other than as test preparation classes. "The scores go up in these classrooms, but academic quality goes down. The result is a growing inequality between the content and quality of education provided to white, middle-class children and that provided to those in poor and minority school" (p. 730).

In an article on Service-Learning by Billig (2000), she stressed the attributes of community to student involvement and its positive results in attitude and test scores. She also explained the limitations to this portion of the reform movement because of a lack of understanding:

> Just what is service-learning? Is it a model, a program, pedagogy, or a philosophy? What key elements need to be in place for a program to claim to be service-learning? What does 'best practices' look like? What are the effects and impacts of service-learning? Do the characteristics (for example, grade level, age, socioeconomic status) of the participants matter? Do the characteristics of and relationships with the service recipients influence outcomes? Do school characteristics matter? Does the sponsor or the service targets make a difference? (p. 662).

She went on to say that 10 years of research and practice should shed some light on the above questions. While she did not disagree that service-learning helps with students' understanding of community, responsibility to community, and academic curriculum integration, the main disagreements arise when people try and distinguish this process from the many others. Where and how does it fit?

In another area that indicates limitations to Effective School Research and its Correlates is an article by Judith March and Karen Peters (2002). In this review of a survey on six school districts (two urban, two suburban, and two rural) whose boards had adopted the Effective School process, the findings, while encouraging, also showed weaknesses. While there were significant trends and patterns established, it became evident that there was a strong relationship between the level of the building principal's involvement and the success of teachers and students. "Those of us at Kent State were naturally disappointed that some of the same problems that the teachers had previously encountered-among them the inconsistency of implementation and the failure of some principals to be fully involved-were still occurring" (p. 381).

Gratz (2000), in an article discussing implementation of reform, shared his concerns:

> Reforms in education tend to follow a pattern. First, the statements of the problems are more compelling, complete, and accurate than the proposed solutions. Second, the reforms over promise, but under deliver. Third, even the most promising initiatives usually fail when tried on a broader scale . . . Finally, too many education reforms are driven by political ideology rather than by what

> actually works in schools. Given this pattern, it is hardly surprising that most reforms have little lasting impact on schools (p. 681).

He indicated that if success were easy to measure, then successful practice could be identified. “But educational accountability is still in its infancy . . . ” (p. 681). In a later section of the article, he reminded the reader about Charles Lindblom who observed that public institutions are often slow to change. Imagine, he said, the chaos if schools transformed themselves with each new educational idea. He further said that it is absurd to think that school systems can implement substantive change in a year or two.

Wade Carpenter (2000), in an article in reference to change, had a different approach. Where Donald Gratz wrote about the lack of schools to change, Carpenter wrote about the mass amount of change in public schools. He quotes St. Teresa of Avila in his opening remarks, “Do not pursue so much that you catch nothing.” Carpenter reviewed articles in *Phi Delta Kappan* between May 1987 and May 1997. In his review he was searching for articles that would . . . “enhance, reform, and even save American education” (p. 383). In his research, he counted 361 good ideas that were shared in the pages of the *Phi Delta Kappan*. The author went on to stress that none of the ideas were bad. He even wrote how bad people don’t generally go into education. He further shared that it is depressing that the ideas were good. In his article he said that there were two categories of problems that were suggested by the past 10 years of research. “Under the first category, we find four subproblems: problems of dogma, design, duration, and domain. Under the second category, we find problems of distribution” (p. 385). The author went on to describe four types of dogma: humanistic, the student-centered, the

social-efficiency, and the social-meliorist currents. Within the four dogmas are the types of reformers. The humanistic dogma has what the author referred to as eggheads. They serve a noble cause: the life of the mind. The author suggested that these scholars tend to neglect the importance of the heart and the hands. The student-centered dogma has as its reformer what the author referred to as warm fuzzies. These reformers, according to the author, want education to serve the needs and interest of the student to promote self-esteem, self-actualization, and compassion. They too are kind, decent, and intelligent people who want to help each child lead the fullest possible life. But they often seem to underestimate the intellectual and over romanticize the social/personal nature of the child. He stressed that to follow this line can possibly lead to 'dumbing down' the curriculum and he expressed the view that schools who fail academically, fail absolutely. The social-efficiency dogma has its resolvers who advocate that we should accommodate the children in reference to their culture, companions, and corporations. "The reformers, who would reconstruct the unjust society in the interest of the unquiet ideal, are often given to slippery-slope and hyperbolic arguments [he suggests to the reader we review Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed]"* (p.385). In both cases, the author states, the resulting data and policies can be grotesquely flawed. Finally, he discussed those who take a narrow theoretical focus and are identified as reformers:

> Take the currently fashionable constructivism, for instance. One wonders if the enthusiasts who dive into this approach because it offers student involvement in learning are unaware that there are many other ways to elicit student activity and ownership, some of them originating in the classics (p. 385).

The final portion of his discussion of reform is in reference to distribution. The author said the weakness of this area is that it places the burden of education reform squarely on the shoulders of teachers. Though he agreed that over the past decade many of the ideas he researched have been very good and he also agreed that implementation of some of these program has shown growth in academic achievement, he does end with a caveat. One is that we have seen some improvements in student achievement, but the growth has not been acceptable in relation to the amount of ideas shared and tried. Two, the very act of the use of the ideas has intensified the teachers' job beyond acceptability. He said the teachers are overloaded and burnout is not as much a psychological problem as it is a policy problem. He said our schools are awash in money, but the results are not there. He ended his article with a quote by Robert Maynard Hutchins (1968), who noted decades ago in his book, *The Learning Society*, "One who proclaims salvation through education evades the necessity of doing something about the slums. One who sees education as the prime requirements of the poverty-stricken nations does not have to try to keep them from starving. Those who talk of education as the sole means of solving the race problem, or of obtaining lasting peace, or of curing juvenile delinquency, often seem to mean that they have not much interest in inconveniencing themselves about them."

In an article by Tim Zukas (2000), he shared his concern about the latest round of reforms. In this article, the parent shared his concern in a clear message that shows the limitations of this reform:

> I have a very narrow set of interests. I do not care about the latest advances in brain research. I won't get excited about claims of potential big performance gains. If you tell me about self-esteem one more time, I will become ill. Although I want what is best for all students, I am much more interested in how your proposals will affect my child. It is not that I am uncaring but that I have a special responsibility for her. I will not let you forget her needs so that you can help someone else. If you want my support, talk to me specifically about your reform's impact on her. After you address her needs, I can think about the potential benefits to others (p. 54).

The major portion of the article is the request for communication with parents and that the professional educators must realize that the scope of understanding of parents is and will be focused on their children. He remarked at one point that, "Often during times of change, parents are asked to be flexible. That flexibility goes both ways" (p. 52). He stressed that it is more important for the educators to develop relationships with parents instead of playing politics. The more educators play politics, the more opposition will be created for the long term. "Remember that you are asking these parents to entrust you with the well-being of their children. Let all your actions show that you take that responsibility seriously" (p. 55).

Summary

This review of the literature has revealed the following:

1. The Effective Schools Research and the Correlates have moved from its

beginning stages in the early 1970s into a new direction that encompasses systemic change.

2. The research to date has been mostly review articles and theoretical articles in relation to Effective School Research as a whole. When you reduce the research to the Correlates there are more articles available.

3. Research indicates that there is still ambiguity in relation to a cohesive understanding of the definitions of the Effective School Correlates and their application.

4. While there is sufficient research to indicate the use of the Correlates the limitations are directly connected to the environment in which they are placed. This study, which explored the impact and application of the Correlates as stated in Effective School Research, was designed to contribute to this void in the literature.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A survey research methodology was used for gathering and reporting data in this inquiry. The purpose of the research is to provide a systematic and accurate description of facts and characteristics of the population of interest. Quantitative data were obtained using basic questionnaire techniques outlined in *Educational Research: An Introduction* (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

This inquiry's purposes were to answer all three of the research questions:

Research Question #1

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

Research Question #2

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in the correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

Research Question #3

How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County, Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system?

This chapter will describe the procedures used to identify the research population, develop the questionnaires, collection procedures, and data analysis.

Population

The population for this study was the teachers and administrators of three selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas. The breakdown of the population was 80 teachers and five administrators in these three schools, giving a total population of 85. Consent was given by the participant to become part of the population by returning the questionnaire.

Procedures

The researcher reviewed different methodologies with his chair, Dr. David Erlandson. Development of the survey was in conjunction with Dr. Erlandson and consultation was also sought from a selected committee of practitioners in the field of correctional education. Members of the doctoral committee judged the survey as satisfactory.

The researcher sent a copy of the proposal and a cover letter to the Director of The Brown Schools of Harris County requesting permission to conduct the study and to gather research information. A copy of the letter requesting permission is in Appendix A. A formal meeting was held with the Director of The Brown Schools of Harris County and a full explanation of the study given.

Staff information was requested from the personnel office of The Brown Schools in relation to the three charter schools and names, mailing addresses, e-mail addresses, phone numbers, and job classification were received.

The procedure for completion of the survey included a packet that was mailed to the teachers' and administrators' attention for their completion. The packet included a

cover letter explaining the proposed study, which is in Appendix B; a cover letter from the Director of the Charter Schools, which is in Appendix C; the questionnaire, which is in Appendix D; and a self-addressed stamped envelope to facilitate ease of return to the researcher. The participants were told that their responses were confidential, that they could refuse to participate in the study, and that the instrument would take approximately 30 minutes or less to complete.

Follow-up mailings were sent out in order to obtain a return rate of 80%, the amount considered to be the minimum acceptable rate. Approximately one month after the initial mailing, an additional mail-out was sent to non-respondents. Within two weeks of the second mail-out, a phone call or email reminder from the researcher was conducted and an interview or submission of responses by email was offered. The process was repeated for completion of the additional questionnaire in a third and final mail-out one month later.

The questionnaire provided information to answer research questions one and two. It also provided initial information for research question three by asking respondents to suggest recommended changes for each of the Effective School Correlates to make them more relevant to charter schools.

Development of the Questionnaire

The development of the questionnaire for this study began when the review of literature revealed a potential lack of fit between the Effective School Correlates as the "Key Characteristics of Effective Schools" and their relevance to the context of alternative schools for students in the correctional systems. A panel of expert educators

in the field of correctional education was created with the purpose of determining the relevance of the correlates.

Using the framework of the Effective School Correlates (Lezotte, 1996) and taking the basic explanations and definitions given, a tentative questionnaire was designed that reflected the correlates and their indicators. This design was presented to the panel of experts. The panel of experts was: an assistant superintendent of Windham Schools Texas Department of Corrections, the Director of The Brown Schools of Harris County, and a principal of an educational facility within the Texas Department of Corrections. The panel members critiqued the proposed questionnaire and approved the design.

The questionnaire was made-up of seven Effective School Correlates with a total of 27 indicators. The indicators were statements of clarity for each of the correlates. The use of a four-point scale rather than a five-point scale was made to ensure that the values assigned to the answer were not neutral. The respondents were asked to answer the questions by checking or circling the appropriate answer that most accurately described their choice.

Data Collection Procedures

This survey was conducted during the fall and winter of 2002 and 2003. A packet of materials was mailed in a large manila envelope. The packet contained a letter from the Director of The Brown Schools introducing the questionnaire and indicating that participation was entirely voluntary. There was also an information sheet, a letter from the researcher, a self-addressed pre-posted return envelope, and the precoded

survey instrument. The precodes were directly correlated to each of the participants to facilitate follow-up mailings.

Receipt of each questionnaire was recorded in a cumulative log, and each respondent was then removed from the computerized mail file which had been developed. After the first mailing, 27 had been returned. Of the 27, five responses were disqualified due to returned packets. The researcher called the personnel office and found they no longer worked for the schools. Three respondents also recommended changes to the correlates. Two requested that several of the correlates be blended together and one suggested that a correlate be dropped all together. Upon return of the first mail-out, no respondents actually rewrote portions of the correlates as requested by the researcher.

One month later, on November 4, 2002, the first follow-up was sent to nonrespondents. In this mailing, each nonrespondent was offered a second copy of the survey together with the complete packet of materials. Additionally, nonrespondents were contacted by telephone during the week of November 11, 2002, to encourage their participation in the survey and the opportunity to restate the correlates. These efforts resulted in 25 returned questionnaires. Of the 25 returned questionnaires, there were only two respondents that suggested changes to the correlates. In both cases the written changes altered the wording, but not the intent of the correlate. While the survey instrument was returned answered, the opportunity to restate the correlates was not taken by the majority of the respondents.

A third follow-up with another complete packet of survey materials was mailed to nonrespondents on December 4, 2002. A final deadline of January 20, 2003 was requested. Twenty-four additional responses were received by that time, resulting in a cumulative response rate of 88.7%. Of the 24 respondents three restated the correlates, giving a total of eight respondents who restated and/or made suggestions to change the correlates. Of the 80 surveys returned, eight respondents restated and/or made suggestions to change the correlates.

Of the 85 members in the original population, five were disqualified because they were no longer working for the school at the time of the survey. Thus, the population size was adjusted to 80 from 85. With this adjusted population size, the actual usable response rate was considered to be 71/80, or 88.7%. A summary of response rates from each mailing is provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Summary of Response Rates from First round, Second Round, and Third Mailings

Mailing	Total Responses	
	n	%
First Round	22	27.5
Second Round	25	31.2
Third Round	24	30.0

Original Population Size..……..	85
Non respondents with Disqualifier……	5
Adjusted Population Size……..	80
Nonrespondents……	9
Usable Returns……..	71
Percentage of Usable Returns…… (Using Adjusted Population Sizes)	88.7%

Responses were received from the three selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas. Table 3.2 summarizes the percent of the total that each school represented and the corresponding rate of return for each school. Note that the percents of total for the respondents in each school were consistent with the percents of the total population. In other words, proportional allocation was used and the responses were also proportional.

Table 3.2

Total Members Per School and Total Respondents at Each School

	Members Surveyed		Total Respondents		Response Rate
Schools	#	Percent	#	Percent	%
School A	31	36.5	26	30.6	83.9
School B	26	30.6	23	27.1	88.5
School C	28	32.9	22	25.9	78.6

All three schools had a principal and two of the schools had counselors. Table 3.3 summarizes the percent of the total that each administrative member represented and the corresponding rate of return for each school.

Table 3.3

Total Administrative Members Per School and Total Respondents at Each School

	Members Surveyed		Total Respondents		Response Rate
Schools	#	Percent	#	Percent	%
School A	2	2.4	2	2.4	100.0
School B	2	2.4	2	2.4	100.0
School C	1	1.2	1	1.2	100

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were obtained using basic questionnaire techniques outlined in *Educational Research: An Introduction* (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996) and analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for Social Studies (SPSS) Standard Version 12.0 (2004) computer software. Descriptive statistical analysis produced mean and frequency tables, measures of central tendency, standard deviation and t-test. Results of the study are

reported using numerical and graphic techniques. Multiple displays such as tables, charts, and graphs are also used to present the findings.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative educational settings for students in a correction system as identified by the teachers and administrators in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas. The answers to the following questions were sought in this study:

1. To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?
2. To what extent are the Effective school Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in the correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?
3. How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County, Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system?

Seven Effective School Correlates with their twenty-seven indicators were of specific interest in a written questionnaire mailed to the entire population. Administrators and teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire and rate the Correlate indicators as to whether they were “relevant,” “sometimes,” “seldom,” or “irrelevant” to the alternative educational system. These two groups of professionals

were also to make recommended changes to the Correlates that they felt needed changing to better fit the alternative school system.

Chapter IV provides the results of the written questionnaire completed by the entire population.

The chapter is arranged into four sections. Section one analyzed the total individual responses to the Correlates and the indicators which is in Table 4.1. The second section of the chapter analyzed the administrative respondents to the research question number one in Table 4.2. The third section of the chapter analyzed the frequency of the teacher respondents to research question two from each of the three schools, which is in Table 4.3. School A is Table 4.4, school B is Table 4.5, and school C is Table 4.6. The fourth section of the chapter is a comparison of administrator and teacher responses which is shown in Tables 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9. The final section of the chapter is the summary and conclusion.

Section One

This section summarizes the total individual respondents to the Correlate indicators that are in Table 4.1. The respondents were grouped according to their locations into teachers in Schools A, B, and C and administrators. Seven Effective School Correlates with their twenty-seven indicators were of specific interest in a written questionnaire mailed to the entire population. Administrators and teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire and rate the Correlate indicators as to whether they were "relevant," "sometimes," "seldom," or "irrelevant" to the alternative educational system.

Table 4.1

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of the Total Respondents to the Correlate Indicators

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders								
School A	6	25.0	5	20.8	7	29.2	6	25.0
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19.0	5	23.8
School C	9	42.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	4	19.0
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	29	40.8	11	15.5	16	22.5	15	21.1
Indicator 2: The mission statement status that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	5	20.8	1	4.2
School B	7	33.3	6	28.6	4	19.0	4	19.0
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8
Administration	2	40.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Total	30	42.3	6	22.5	19	26.8	6	8.5
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	0	0.0
School B	8	38.1	5	23.8	5	23.8	3	14.3
School C	10	47.6	6	28.6	4	19.0	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	36	50.7	16	22.5	15	21.1	4	5.6
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2
School B	10	47.6	1	4.8	7	33.3	3	14.3
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	40	56.3	14	19.7	12	16.9	5	7.0

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
School A	17	70.8	5	20.8	2	8.3	0	0.0
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
School C	18	85.7	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	52	73.2	12	16.9	5	7.0	2	2.8
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
School A	12	50.0	5	20.8	7	29.2	0	0.0
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	42	59.2	16	22.5	12	16.9	1	1.4
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.								
School A	13	54.2	3	12.5	7	29.2	1	4.2
School B	13	61.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	0	0.0
School C	12	57.1	6	28.6	2	9.5	1	4.8
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	40	56.3	15	21.1	14	19.7	2	2.8
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruption of class.								
School A	10	41.7	6	25.0	8	33.3	0	0.0
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	6	28.6	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	4	19.0	2	9.5
Administration	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	28	39.4	22	31.0	18	25.4	3	4.2
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	6	25.0	0	0.0
School B	10	47.6	3	14.3	8	38.1	0	0.0
School C	12	57.1	4	19.0	4	19.0	1	4.8
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	38	53.5	14	19.7	18	25.4	1	1.4

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership								
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make								
School A	5	20.8	5	20.8	10	41.7	4	16.7
School B	6	28.6	6	28.6	8	38.1	4	4.8
School C	5	23.8	2	9.5	8	8.1	6	28.6
Administration	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0
Total	16	22.5	13	18.3	30	42.3	12	16.9
Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
School A	10	41.7	3	125.0	8	33.3	3	12.5
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	5	23.8	2	9.5
School C	9	42.9	0	0.0	10	47.6	2	9.5
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	26	36.6	15	21.1	23	32.4	7	9.9
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
School A	16	66.7	5	20.8	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	14	66.7	4	19.0	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	15	71.4	3	14.3	2	9.5	1	4.8
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	50	70.4	12	16.9	8	113.0	1	1.4
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their								
School A	12	50.0	7	29.2	5	20.8	0	0.0
School B	6	28.6	12	57.1	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Administration	2	40.0	3	650.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	33	46.5	24	33.8	13	18.3	1	1.4
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their								
School A	5	20.8	11	45.8	6	25.0	2	8.3
School B	6	28.6	9	42.9	4	19.0	2	9.5
School C	3	14.3	7	33.3	9	42.9	2	9.5
Administration	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Total	15	21.1	29	40.8	21	29.6	6	8.5

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate D: High Expectations for All	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
School A	8	33.0	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	2	9.5	13	61.9	6	28.6	0	0.0
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	5	23.8	1	4.8
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	22	31.0	34	47.9	14	19.7	1	1.4
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
School A	12	50.0	9	37.5	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	5	23.8	13	61.9	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	7	33.3	8	38.1	4	19.0	2	9.5
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	28	39.4	31	43.7	10	14.1	2	2.8
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
School A	13	54.2	5	20.8	4	16.7	2	8.3
School B	15	71.4	3	14.3	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	16	76.2	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	9.5
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	49	69.0	9	12.7	9	12.7	4	5.6

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.								
School A	8	33.3	14	58.3	2	8.3	0	0.0
School B	3	14.3	14	66.7	3	14.3	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	4	19.0	7	33.3	0	0.0
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	23	32.4	35	49.3	12	16.9	1	1.4
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.								
School A	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	4	19.0	14	66.7	2	9.5	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8
Administration	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Total	25	35.2	31	43.7	13	18.3	2	2.8
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
School A	7	29.2	10	41.7	5	20.8	2	8.3
School B	7	33.3	10	47.6	2	9.5	2	9.5
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	2	9.5
Administration	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Total	25	35.2	25	35.2	15	21.1	6	8.5
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2
School B	8	38.1	8	38.1	4	19.0	1	4.8
School C	12	57.0	4	19.0	3	14.3	2	9.5
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	35	49.3	21	29.6	11	15.5	4	5.6

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
School A	10	41.7	7	29.2	6	25.0	1	4.2
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	7	33.3	2	9.5
School C	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
Total	36	50.7	15	21.1	15	21.1	5	7.1
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	0	0.0
School B	10	47.6	4	19.0	7	33.3	0	0.0
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	41	57.7	11	15.5	18	25.4	1	1.4
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
School A	17	70.8	3	12.5	4	16.7	0	0.0
School B	12	57.1	3	14.3	6	28.6	0	0.0
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8
Administration	4	8.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	49	69.0	10	14.1	11	15.5	1	1.4

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
School A	3	12.5	5	20.8	7	29.2	9	37.5
School B	3	14.3	5	23.8	5	23.8	8	38.1
School C	4	19.0	7	33.3	5	23.8	5	23.8
Administration	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Total	10	14.1	21	29.6	18	25.4	22	31.0
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
School A	4	16.7	2	83.0	8	33.3	10	41.7
School B	5	23.8	1	4.8	10	47.6	5	23.8
School C	2	9.5	8	38.1	5	23.8	6	28.6
Administration	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	11	15.5	16	22.5	23	32.4	21	29.6
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.								
School A	2	8.3	9	37.5	7	29.2	6	25.0
School B	6	28.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	6	28.6
School C	5	23.8	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19.0
Administration	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Total	16	22.5	22	31.0	17	23.9	16	22.5

Indicator 1 sought information as to whether there had been input by all of the stakeholders in regards to the mission. While the five administrators believed Indicator 1 was relevant, the teachers were less clear. More than half the School A teachers indicated that Indicator 1 was either “irrelevant” or “seldom” relevant. A plurality of the teachers in Schools B and C said it was “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant, with a response of 57%.

Indicator 2 sought information about whether the specific statement implying that all children can learn the adopted curriculum was present within the mission statement. The data imply that the administrators were not so certain about this indicator. Three of the five responded that Indicator 2 was "seldom" relevant. The teachers showed a stronger response to this indicator. The three schools' data showed that over 60% of teachers answered that this indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 sought information about whether the mission statement is evident in the routine activities of the school. All five of the administrators responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. The teachers also gave a strong favorable response to this indicator, with well over 60% either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 4 sought information whether there was sufficient planning by all stakeholders in regard to the changing needs of the school. The administrators responded that this indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. The data show an interesting response by the teachers of the three schools. School A teachers responded that Indicator 4 was "relevant" 41.7% and "sometimes" relevant 37.5%. This indicator is in regards to planning, which must include collegial communication between the teachers and administrators. The teachers at School A do not show a strong response. Teachers in School B, also were less clear. While 47.6% showed that the indicator was "relevant," only 4.8% indicated that it was "sometimes" relevant, leaving 47.6% indicating that the indicator was only "seldom" to "irrelevant." The teachers in School C responded strongly (90.5%) that the indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. The

responses by the teachers imply strong communication and collegial contributions to Indicator 4 by School C. School A teachers show some communication and collegial contributions, but School B teachers were less clear.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership has six indicators. The survey asked whether each of the Correlates and its indicators were relevant.

Indicator 1 asked whether the principals meet with teachers to plan and discuss instructional programs. The administrators show a strong response of 80% that this indicator is "relevant." The teachers responded that this indicator is also "relevant" with Schools A and B showing over 62% as "relevant" and School C indicating 86% "relevant." Again, School C indicates a strong response to the indicator, with only 4.8% of the teachers indicating a "sometimes" response. Schools A and B both had responses of "sometimes" in the low to mid 20% range.

Indicator 2 asked whether the principal is visible in classrooms. The administrators responded that 80% felt this indicator was "relevant." While all three schools' responses were all positive, these responses were not as strong as the administrators' responses. School A teachers responded with 70.8% to the indicator as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant, but had 29.2% responding as "seldom" relevant. Schools B and C had more of a plurality, with both showing 86% for "relevant" and "sometimes" relevant and a response of 14.3% for "seldom" or "irrelevant."

Indicator 3 asked whether the principal monitors student progress. All three schools' teachers and the five administrators responded that this indicator was relevant.

The administrator responses were interesting. Of the five administrator responses, three (60%) showed that it was "sometimes" relevant. The teachers at the three schools, while showing a positive response, also were somewhat unclear. School A teachers responded 67% that the indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Yet, 29.2% indicated they felt the indicator was "seldom" relevant or "irrelevant." School B also had a strong showing for the indicator at 76.2% for "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant, but also had 23.8% showing "seldom" or "irrelevant." School C had the strongest response in relation to the indicator with an 86% "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 4 asked whether the principal limits interruptions of class would be relevant. The administrators responded that this indicator was "relevant." Yet, two of the five administrators only responded with a "sometimes" relevant. Schools A, B, and C showed a response of "relevant" and "sometimes" relevant in the high (60%) range. Schools A and B also showed a 33% "seldom" or "irrelevant." School C showed a 19% "seldom" or "irrelevant."

Indicator 5 asked whether the teachers and administrator work together to establish academic benchmarks for the students. The administrators showed a strong (100%) response to this indicator as "relevant." Again, while the teachers of the three schools indicate they felt that Indicator 5 was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant, with a positive showing in the low 70% range, there were still teachers who did not agree. In School A, 25% indicated that they felt that Indicator 5 was "seldom" relevant. School B responded with 38% that Indicator 5 was "seldom" relevant. While School C showed that only 19% of the teachers implied that Indicator 5 was "irrelevant."

Indicator 6 asked whether the Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved in making instructional programs work successfully. The responses by the four groups were most interesting. The five administrators showed that Indicator 6 was "seldom" relevant by 80% and "irrelevant" by 20%. The schools however, were not as clear. School A teachers responded with 41.6% showing Indicator 6 as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. They also showed a strong 58.4% as "seldom" or "irrelevant." School B responded with 57.2% showing Indicator 6 as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. The teachers also showed a 43.2% as "seldom" or "irrelevant." School C also responded with less than a positive percentage for Indicator 6. School C responded with 33.3% indicating "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. This school's response in regard to "seldom" at 8.1% and "irrelevant" at 28.6%, also matched with the other two schools. It is interesting to note that 17% of the total respondents to Indicator 6 showed as "irrelevant." Also, all the administrators showed a total lack of support for this indicator.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, has four indicators. The survey asked whether each of the indicators were "relevant."

The first indicator asks whether the school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups. The answers from the four groups were very interesting. Schools A and C and the administration responded that 41% of the time this indicator is "relevant," while School B indicated it is "relevant" only 23% of the time. In regards to "sometimes" the respondents were even wider in their answers. School A indicated that the indicator is applicable only 12.5% of the time, and School C answered 0%, while the

administration response was 60%. School B responded that the indicator is 43% "sometimes" relevant. In looking at the responses for "seldom" and "irrelevant," the numbers are even more interesting. School A responded with 46%, School B responded with 33%, and School C responded strongly with 58%. The administration responded completely different at 0% for "seldom" and "irrelevant," indicating a wide difference of opinion between teachers and administration for this indicator.

Indicator 2 asks the question whether the students are given regular feedback on their performance. The answers by the respondents to this indicator were strongly viewed by all. Schools A, B, and C responded in the middle 60% to low 70% that this indicator was "relevant." The administrators responded at 100%. All four responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant in the 80% to 100% range, with very few in the "seldom" to "irrelevant" range.

Indicator 3 asks the question whether the parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress. These indicator responses produce interesting results. School A respondents replied that in regards to "relevant" 50% felt this was important, while the other 50% responded that it was either "sometimes" or "seldom" relevant. School B also showed an interesting response. Of the teachers that responded, 27% indicated that the indicator was "relevant," while 71% indicated that the indicator was either "sometimes" or "seldom" relevant. School C responded differently than Schools A or B. The teachers in School C responded that 62% felt this indicator was "relevant." The administrators responded that the indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant 100% of the time.

Indicator 4 asks the question whether the parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavioral progress. Schools A and B both responded that this indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant in the 60% range. School C responded that it was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant at 48%, and further indicated that the indicator was "seldom" relevant 43% of the time. The responses from School C indicate a difference between it and the other two schools. The administration while responding that the indicator was "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant 60% of the time, also had respondents that indicated it was "seldom" relevant 40% of the time. The data imply that there may be a split between the four groups. School A and B responded that the indicator is "relevant" to "sometimes" relevant, while School C and administration imply that while they accept more strongly the indicator is "sometimes" relevant, there are over 40% of the respondents who believe it is either "seldom" or "irrelevant."

The summary of the frequencies and percentages of the total respondents to the Correlate indicators is reported in Table 4.1. Correlate D: High Expectations for All has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 asks the question whether teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expects them to master the academic benchmarks. Of the four groups, Schools A and C and administration responded that this indicator was "relevant" 33% to 48% of the time. School B, interestingly, responded that the indicator was "relevant" only 10% of the time, but that over 60% of the time the indicator was relevant

"sometimes." From 71% to 87% of all teachers, and 100% of the administrators, believed that Indicator 1 was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Less than 20% of the teachers believed the indicator was "seldom" relevant. Only one respondent of all the groups, a teacher from School C, indicated that this indicator was "irrelevant."

Indicator 2 asks the respondents if teaching is a key factor in helping students learn. We would expect all teachers to believe that this indicator has relevancy, yet two teachers, both from School C, believed this indicator "irrelevant." Generally, teachers and administrators believed that this indicator was either "relevant" with a 40% response or "sometimes" relevant with a 44% response, for a combined response of 83% as either "relevant" or "sometimes."

Indicator 3 asks the respondents if a student's race, color, or background are not primary factors in student achievement. As with Indicator 2, two teachers from School C believed that this indicator was "irrelevant," presumably believing that these personal attributes are "relevant." In contrast, 100% of the administrators questioned and nearly 82% of all respondents believed that this indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant, with a strong percentage, 69%, responding that it was "relevant."

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the relevancy of effective teaching-learning processes. Only one respondent, a teacher from School B, responded that the indicator was "irrelevant." An overwhelming 82% of the respondents reported that the indicator was either

"sometimes" relevant or "relevant." Interestingly, teachers at School C had both the greatest response that the indicator was "relevant" (48%) and that it was "seldom" relevant (33%). The other teachers in School A and B responded with barely 7% of total response that the indicator was "seldom" relevant and all administrators responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 2 surveyed whether teachers using a variety of materials and activities was "relevant." One teacher in both Schools B and C responded that this indicator was "irrelevant." Otherwise, teachers and administrators together responded nearly 80% that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Administrators believed the indicator was "relevant" at a higher percentage overall (60%) than teachers at School A (33%) or School C (48%). Teachers at School B were more hesitant to respond that the indicator was "relevant," totaling only 19%, but responded overwhelmingly (86%) that the indicator was at least "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 referred to the relevancy of a teacher's use of culture and heritage to build a positive self-concept. Two teacher respondents at each school reported that this indicator was "irrelevant." Interestingly, only 20% of the administrators believed that this indicator was "relevant." The rest of the administrator responses were evenly divided between "sometimes" and "seldom" relevant. The majority of teachers at each of the schools believed more in this indicator's relevance. The response ranged from a low of 62% of the teachers in School C reporting that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant to a high of 81% in School B. School C had the highest percentage of all respondents reporting that the indicator was "relevant (48%) and the

highest percentage of the teacher respondents reporting that the indicator was “seldom” relevant (29%).

Indicator 4 referred to the relevancy of providing additional materials for students who fail to show progress. One teacher at both Schools A and B and two teachers at School C responded that this indicator was “irrelevant.” In sharp contrast, 100% of the administrators responded that the indicator was “relevant.” Almost 80% of all respondents replied that the indicator was either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant. The teachers at School C responded at a higher percentage (57%) than the teachers at the other two schools (42% at School A and 38% at School B) that the indicator was “relevant.”

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to a safe and orderly classroom and school with effective discipline. Response to this indicator was interesting in that every respondent category recorded at least one entry noting that the indicator was “irrelevant.” The total number of respondents were evenly divided (15 each) between “sometimes” relevant and “seldom” relevant. The teachers at School C reported the indicator as either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant at a combined higher percentage (85%) than any other respondent category. The administrators’ response was split at 80% “relevant” and 20% “irrelevant.”

Indicator 2 refers to students held accountable for good citizenship. The administrators' response differed somewhat from the teachers' in all responses of the schools. All of the administrators responded that the indicator was either "relevant" (80%) or "sometimes" relevant (20%). The teachers at each of the schools responded approximately 23% to 33% that the indicator was "seldom" relevant and one teacher from School C responded that this was an "irrelevant" indicator.

Indicator 3 refers to the existence of a safe and secure school. As with Indicator 2 above, all of the administrators responded that the indicator was either "relevant" (80%) or "sometimes" relevant (20%). Also, as with Indicator 2 above, one teacher from School C responded that this was an "irrelevant" indicator. Generally, the teachers from each school responded that Indicator 3 was more "relevant" than Indicator 2 with Schools A and C responding 71% and 76%, respectively, that the indicator was "relevant."

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the opportunities provided to parents to discuss school mission, goals, and reporting systems. The response to this indicator was unusual as 31% of the total response (all from teachers responding) deemed this indicator as "irrelevant." Only 14% of the responses (again, all from teachers responding) deemed this indicator as "relevant." The administrators responded with more caution that this indicator was "sometimes" relevant (80%) and "seldom" relevant (20%).

Section Two

The first research question of this study asked: To what extent are the Effective School Correlates "relevant" to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

The respondents were asked to indicate to what degree, "relevant," "sometimes," "seldom," or "irrelevant," the Correlates were in their setting. Table 4.2 represents the frequencies and percentages of responses to the various questions by the participants in the study.

Table 4.2

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of the Administrator Respondents to the Correlate Indicators

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.								
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum								
Administration	2	40.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 4: An annual planning process in in place to address the changing needs of								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.								
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.								
Administration	3	60.0	40	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.								
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instruction program work successfully.								
Administration	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.								
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavior progress.								
Administration	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0.0

Correlate D: High Expectations for All								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.								
Administration	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.								
Administration	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
Administration	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
Administration	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
Administration	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
Administration	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
Administration	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
Administration	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.								
Administration	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0

The summary of the frequencies and percentages of the total respondents to the Correlate indicators is reported above in Table 4.2. Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate. The survey asked whether each of the Correlates and its indicators were "relevant." Indicator 1, a mission statement developed by all stakeholders, was deemed "relevant" by 100% of the administrators.

Indicator 2, a mission statement that affirms that all children can learn the adopted curriculum, showed more diversity in the administrator respondents. Only 40% responded that this indicator was "relevant" and 60% responded as "seldom" relevant.

Indicator 3, a mission statement evidenced in the routine activities of the schools, won more favor with the administrators. The respondents reported this indicator "relevant" (80%) and "sometimes" relevant (20%). Indicator 4, the existence of an

annual planning process, was deemed “relevant” by the same percentage (80%) and “sometimes” relevant (20%).

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, has six indicators. All six indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the principal meeting with teachers to discuss the instructional program. Eighty percent of the administrators deemed this indicator “relevant” and 20% rated it as “sometimes” relevant. Indicator 2, the principal visible in the classroom, was deemed “relevant” by the same percentage as Indicator 1, above (80%) and “sometimes” relevant also by the same percentage (20%). Indicator 3, principal monitoring student progress, showed a difference from the first two indicators of the Correlate. Only 40% of the administrators deemed this indicator as “relevant” and 60% responded that it was “sometimes” relevant. For Indicator 4, principal limits interruptions of class, the response was reversed, with 60% rating this indicator “relevant” and 40% “sometimes” relevant.

Indicator 5, establishing academic benchmarks and helping students achieve them, was rated as “relevant” by 100% of the administrators. This unanimity among the administrators for “relevant” indicators dissolved for Indicator 6, presence of an actively involved superintendent and school board to make the instructional program successful. No administrator responded that Indicator 6 was either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant. Eighty percent responded that this indicator was “seldom” relevant and 20% responded that it was actually “irrelevant.”

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the school's academic benchmarks being shared with stakeholder groups. The administrators' response indicated that 40% of them deemed Indicator 1 was "relevant" and 60% deemed the indicator was "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 2 refers to students receiving regular feedback on their performance. This indicator was deemed "relevant" by 100% of the administrators.

Indicator 3 refers to parents being provided appropriate and timely information on their child's academic progress. This indicator had the same response as Indicator 1, above, perhaps due to the similarity of the indicators, as parents are a stakeholder. It was deemed "relevant" by 40% of the administrators and "sometimes" relevant by 60%.

Indicator 4 prompted a more diversified view by the administrators. This indicator refers to the provision of information to the parents regarding their child's behavioral progress. One administrator responded that this indicator was "relevant" but 40% responded that the indicator was only "sometimes" relevant and likewise, 40% responded that it was "seldom" relevant.

Correlate D: High Expectations for All, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to teachers involving students in the instructional process and mastering benchmarks. Forty percent of the administrators deemed this indicator "relevant" and 60% responded that it was "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 2 refers to teachers believing that their teaching is a key factor. Eighty percent of the administrators responded that this indicator was "relevant" and 20% responded that it was "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 refers to the belief that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in achievement. One hundred percent of the administrators responded that this indicator was "relevant."

Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to teachers developing effective teaching-learning processes. Forty percent of the administrators believed that this indicator was "relevant" and 60% deemed that it is "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 2 refers to teachers using a variety of materials and activities. The administrators were more diversified in their response to this question. While 60% responded that the indicator was "relevant," 20% responded that it was "sometimes" relevant and the same percentage (20%) responded that it was "seldom" relevant.

Indicator 3 refers to the use of the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept. Only 20% of the administrator responses deemed this indicator "relevant," while 40% deemed it as "sometimes" relevant, and a relative strong percentage (40%) felt it was "seldom" relevant.

Indicator 4 refers to the provision of additional activities to students who fail to show progress. The administrators responded unanimously that this indicator was "relevant."

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to a pleasant and inviting school and classroom where discipline is effective. As would be expected from the group who is responsible for maintaining discipline, 80% of the administrators responded that the indicator was "relevant" but, curiously, 20% responded that it was "irrelevant."

Indicator 2 refers to students being held accountable for good citizenship. The administrators' responses were tighter grouped for this question as 80% responded that this was "relevant" and 20% responded that it was "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 refers to the school being a safe and secure place to be. The administrators responded to this question similarly with 80% deeming it "relevant" and 20% as "sometimes" relevant.

Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the opportunity for parents to discuss school mission, goals, and reporting systems. Eighty percent of the administrators responded that this indicator was "sometimes" relevant and 20% deemed it "seldom" relevant.

Indicator 2 refers to an open channel of communication between parents and community and teachers and administrators in helping make decisions. One may expect this response to be stronger, but 100% of the administrators responded that this indicator was just "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 refers to the district encouragement of citizens and businesses to work with the district. Interestingly, the administrators' responses were quite diversified. Sixty percent of the administrators responded to the indicator as "relevant," 20% responded as "sometimes" relevant, and 20% responded as "seldom" relevant.

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents of administrators to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, are listed below. The administrators showed a generally positive response to the indicators of this Correlate as they answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1 by 100% of the respondents, 40% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3 and 100% for Indicator 4. The responses of "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant were answered as 0% for Indicator 1, 60 % for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3, and Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, were universally positive, with the exception of Indicator 6. Administrators responded as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1 by 100% of the respondents, 100% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3, 100% for Indicator 4, 100% for Indicator 5, and 0% for Indicator 6. Likewise, the responses of "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant were answered as 0% for Indicators 1-5 and 100% for Indicator 6.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, showed slightly more diversity than Indicator B, above. The administrators answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant by 100% of the respondents for Indicator 1, 100% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3 and 60% for

Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 60% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, was overwhelmingly positive. One hundred percent of the administrators answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1, 100% for Indicator 2, and 100% for Indicator 3. Correspondingly, 0% of the administrators responded as "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant for Indicator 1, 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, showed more diversity than those for Correlate D, above. One hundred percent of the administrators answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1, 80% for Indicator 2, 60% for Indicator 3, and 100% for Indicator 4. Zero percent of the administrators responded as "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant for Indicator 1, 20% for Indicator 2, 40% for Indicator 3, and 0% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning were similar with one exception. Eighty percent of the administrators answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1, 100% for Indicator 2, and 100% for Indicator 3. Twenty percent of the administrators responded as "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant for Indictor 1, with 0% for Indicator 2 and Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations shows some diversity of opinion. Eighty percent of the administrators answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant for Indicator 1, 100% for Indicator 2, and 80% for Indicator 3. Twenty percent responded as "irrelevant" or "seldom" relevant for Indictor 1, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 20% for Indicator 3.

Section Three

The second research question of this study asked: To what extent are the Effective School Correlates "relevant" to alternative educational settings for students in the correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

The respondents were asked to indicate to what degree, "relevant," "sometimes," "seldom," or "irrelevant," the Correlates were in their setting. Table 4.3 represents the frequencies and percentages of teacher responses to the various questions in the study.

Table 4.3

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of All School Respondents to the Correlate Indicators by the Teachers

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.								
School A	6	25	5	20.8	7	29.2	6	25
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19	5	23.8
School C	9	42.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	4	19
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	5	20.8	1	4.2
School B	7	33.3	6	28.6	4	19	4	19
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25	0	0
School B	8	38.1	5	23.8	5	23.8	3	14.3
School C	10	47.6	6	28.6	4	19	1	4.8
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2
School B	10	47.6	1	4.8	7	33.3	3	14.3
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
School A	17	70.8	5	20.8	2	8.3	0	0.0
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
School C	18	85.7	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	4.8
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
School A	12	50.0	5	20.8	7	29.2	0	0.0
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
School C	18	85.7	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The principal monitors students progress.								
School A	13	54.2	3	12.5	7	29.2	1	4.2
School B	13	61.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	0	0.0
School C	12	57.1	6	28.6	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.								
School A	10	41.7	6	25.0	8	33.3	0	0.0
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	6	28.6	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	4	19.0	2	9.5
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	6	25.0	0	0.0
School B	10	47.6	3	14.3	8	38.1	0	0.0
School C	12	57.1	4	19.0	4	19.0	1	4.8
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.								
School A	5	20.8	5	20.8	10	41.7	4	16.7
School B	6	28.6	6	28.6	8	38.1	1	4.8
School C	5	23.8	2	9.5	8	38.1	6	28.6

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
School A	10	41.7	3	12.5	8	33.3	3	12.5
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	5	23.8	2	9.5
School C	9	42.9	0	0.0	10	47.6	2	9.5
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
School A	16	66.7	5	20.8	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	14	66.7	4	19.0	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	15	71.4	3	14.3	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.								
School A	12	50.0	7	29.2	5	20.8	0	0.0
School B	6	28.6	12	57.1	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavioral progress.								
School A	5	20.8	11	45.8	6	25.0	2	8.3
School B	6	28.6	9	42.9	4	19.0	2	9.5
School C	3	14.3	7	33.3	9	42.9	2	9.5

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate D: High Expectations for All	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
School A	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	2	9.5	13	61.9	6	28.6	0	0.0
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
School A	12	50.0	9	37.5	3	2.5	0	0.0
School B	5	23.8	13	61.9	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	7	33.3	8	38.1	4	19.0	2	9.5
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
School A	13	54.2	5	20.8	4	16.7	2	8.3
School B	15	71.4	3	14.3	3	14.3	0	0.0
School C	16	76.2	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	9.5

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.								
School A	8	33.3	14	58.3	2	8.3	0	0.0
School B	3	14.3	14	66.7	3	14.3	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	4	19.0	7	33.3	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.								
School A	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
School B	4	19.0	14	66.7	2	9.5	1	4.8
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
School A	7	29.2	10	41.7	5	20.8	2	8.3
School B	7	33.3	10	47.6	2	9.5	2	9.5
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	2	9.5
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2
School B	8	38.1	8	38.1	4	19.0	1	4.8
School C	12	57.1	4	19.0	3	14.3	2	9.5

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning.								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
School A	10	47.7	7	29.2	6	25.0	1	4.2
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	7	33.3	2	9.5
School C	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	0	0.0
School B	10	47.6	4	19.0	7	33.3	0	0.0
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
School A	17	70.8	3	12.5	4	16.7	0	0.0
School B	12	57.1	3	14.3	6	28.6	0	0.0
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8

Table 4.3 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
School A	3	12.5	5	20.8	7	29.2	9	37.5
School B	3	14.3	5	23.8	5	23.8	8	38.1
School C	4	19.0	7	33.3	5	23.8	5	23.8
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
School A	4	16.7	2	8.3	8	33.3	10	41.7
School B	5	23.8	1	4.8	10	47.6	5	23.8
School C	2	9.5	8	38.1	5	23.8	6	28.6
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.								
School A	2	8.3	9	37.5	7	29.2	6	25.0
School B	6	28.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	6	28.6
School C	5	23.8	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19.0

The summary of the frequencies and percentages of the total respondents for all three schools to the Correlate indicators is reported above in Table 4.3. Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate. The survey asked whether each of the Correlates and its indicators were “relevant.”

Indicator 1, a mission statement developed by all stakeholders, was deemed “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant by 53% of the teachers in all three schools. Significantly, 15% of the teachers responded that the indicator was “irrelevant.”

Indicator 2, a mission statement that affirms that all children can learn the adopted curriculum, was deemed “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant by a larger proportion (66%) than Indicator 1, above.

Indicator 3, a mission statement evidenced in the routine activities of the schools, won even wider favor among the teachers who responded (71%) as “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant. Indicator 4, the existence of an annual planning process, was also deemed “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant by a high percentage of 75%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents for all three schools for Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, has six indicators. All six indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the principal meeting with teachers to discuss the instructional program. Ninety percent of the teachers responded that this indicator was either “relevant” (73%) or “sometimes” relevant (17%). Indicator 2, the principal visible in the classroom, was deemed “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant also by a high percentage (82%). Indicator 3, principal monitoring student progress, showed a slightly lower positive response from the first two indicators of the Correlate. Seventy-Six percent of the teachers responded that the indicator was either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant. Indicator 4, principal limits interruptions of class, was deemed either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant by 68% of the teachers.

Indicator 5, establishing academic benchmarks and helping students achieve them, was rated as either “relevant” or “sometimes” relevant by 71% of the teachers. Indicator 6, the presence of an actively involved superintendent and school board to

make the instructional program successful, was deemed "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant by only 44% of the teachers. Thirty-nine percent of the teachers responded that this indicator was "seldom" relevant and a significant percent (17%) responded that it was "irrelevant."

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the school's academic benchmarks being shared with stakeholder groups. The teachers' responses indicated that 60% of them deemed Indicator 1 was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Only 11% responded that the indicator was "irrelevant." Indicator 2 refers to students receiving regular feedback on their performance. This indicator was deemed "relevant" by 68% of the teachers and a further 18% responded that the indicator was "sometimes" relevant and the responses were evenly distributed across all three schools. Indicator 3 refers to parents being provided appropriate and timely information on their child's academic progress. This indicator was deemed either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant by 79% of the teachers, with teachers from School C responding strongly as "relevant."

Indicator 4 prompted a more diversified view by the teachers. This indicator refers to the provision of information to the parents regarding their child's behavioral progress. Sixty-two percent of the teachers responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Interestingly, each school had two responses by teachers that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Correlate D: High Expectations for All, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to teachers involving students in the instructional process and mastering benchmarks. Sixty-one percent of the teachers responded that this indicator is either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Only one responder deemed the indicator as "irrelevant." Indicator 2 refers to teachers believing that their teaching is a key factor. Eighty-one percent of the teachers responded that this indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Curiously for teachers, two teachers responded that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Indicator 3 refers to the belief that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in achievement. As would be expected, 81% overwhelmingly deemed this belief indicator as either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Interestingly, 6% of the teachers, from two different schools, responded that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, has four indicators. All four indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to teachers developing effective teaching-learning processes. Eighty percent of the teachers responded that this Indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Only one teacher responded that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Indicator 2 refers to teachers using a variety of materials and activities. The teachers were only slightly less positive of this indicator. Seventy-eight percent responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 3 refers to the use of the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept. Seventy-one percent responded that this indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. However, two teachers from each school deemed the indicator as "irrelevant."

Indicator 4 refers to the provision of additional activities to students who fail to show progress. Seventy-seven percent of the teachers responded that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. This positive response reflected the average tally of "relevant" and "sometimes" relevant of all the indicators in this Correlate.

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regards to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to a pleasant and inviting school and classroom where discipline is effective. The response from the teachers was somewhat diversified. While 71% responded that the indicators were either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant, as many responded that the indicator was "seldom" relevant (23%) and "sometimes" relevant.

Indicator 2 refers to students being held accountable for good citizenship. The teacher responses, when "relevant" and "sometimes relevant" are grouped together, was exactly the same as Indicator 1 (71%) above, but the response to "relevant" is stronger (56%) for Indicator 2 than Indicator 1. Only one teacher responded that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Indicator 3 refers to the school being a safe and secure place. Eighty-two percent of the teachers responded positively that the indicator was either "relevant" or "sometimes" relevant. Similar to Indicator 2, above, only one teacher responded that the indicator was "irrelevant."

Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations has three indicators. All three indicators seek specific verifiable information in regard to the Correlate.

Indicator 1 refers to the opportunity for parents to discuss school mission, goals, and reporting systems. Nearly 60% of the teachers responded that this indicator was either "seldom" relevant (26%) or "irrelevant" (33%). Not unexpected from the group who may rarely discuss these matters, only 15% of the teachers responded that this indicator is "relevant."

Indicator 2 refers to an open channel of communication between parents and community and teachers and administrators in helping make decisions. The teachers responded even more negatively to this indicator than to Indicator 1 above. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers responded that this indicator is either "seldom" or "irrelevant." Only 17% of the teachers responded that the indicator is "relevant."

Indicator 3 refers to the district encouragement of citizens and businesses to work with the district. This indicator received a more diversified response than others in this Correlate. Twenty percent of the teachers responded that the indicator is "relevant," the lowest percentage received by any of the choices. Thirty-two percent responded that the indicator was "sometimes" relevant and 24% deemed the indicator as "seldom" relevant and "irrelevant," respectively.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents for the individual schools is indicated in tables 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6.

Table 4.4

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of School A Respondents to the Correlate Indicators

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.								
School A	6	25.0	5	20.8	7	29.2	6	25.0
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	5	20.8	1	4.2
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	0	0.0
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2

Table 4.4 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
School A	17	70.8	5	20.8	2	8.3	0	0.0
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
School A	12	50.0	5	20.8	7	29.2	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.								
School A	13	54.2	3	12.5	7	29.2	1	4.2
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.								
School A	10	41.7	6	25.0	8	33.3	0	0.0
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.								
School A	11	45.8	7	29.2	6	25.0	0	0.0
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.								
School A	5	20.8	5	20.8	10	41.7	4	16.7

Table 4.4 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
School A	10	41.7	3	12.5	8	33.3	3	12.5
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
School A	16	66.7	5	20.8	3	12.5	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.								
School A	12	50.0	7	29.2	5	20.8	0	0.0
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavior progress.								
School A	5	20.8	11	45.8	6	25.0	2	8.3

Correlate D: High Expectations for All								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
School A	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
School A	12	50.0	9	37.5	3	12.5	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
School A	13	54.2	5	20.8	4	16.7	2	8.3

Table 4.4 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.								
School A	8	33.3	14	58.3	2	8.3	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers us a variety of materials and activities.								
School A	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
School A	7	29.2	10	41.7	5	20.8	2	8.3
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
School A	10	41.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	1	4.2

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
School A	10	41.7	7	29.2	6	25.0	1	4.2
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
School A	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
School A	17	70.8	3	12.5	4	16.7	0	0.0

Table 4.4 (Continued)

Correlate G	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
School A	3	12.5	5	20.8	7	29.2	9	37.5
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
School A	4	16.7	2	8.3	8	33.3	10	41.7
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.								
School A	2	8.3	9	37.5	7	29.2	6	25.0

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School A to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. Indicator 1 received the least number of "relevant" responses for the Correlate. Twenty-five percent of the teachers deemed the indicator "relevant." Indicator 2 received a more positive response with 50%, similarly 58.3% for Indicator 3 while Indicator 4 received a lower "relevant" response of 41.7%. At the other extreme, the response of "irrelevant" for Indicator 1 was answered as 25%, with 4.2% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 4.2% for Indicator 4. With the exception of Indicator 1, which received the same percentage of responses of "relevant" as "irrelevant," the teachers responded at a much higher percentage to the choice of "relevant" than "irrelevant."

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. Indicator 1 received the highest percentage of responses as "relevant" with 70.8%. Indicator 2 received a 50% "relevant" rating with

54.2% for Indicator 3, 41.7% for Indicator 4, 45.8% for Indicator 5, and the lowest response of 20.8% for Indicator 6.

There were very few responses from School A of “irrelevant” for Correlate B. The response of “irrelevant” for Indictor 1 was answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 4.2% for Indicator 3, 0% for Indicator 4, 0% for Indicator 5, and 16.7% for Indicator 6.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 41.7% of the respondents, Indicator 2, received the highest “relevant” responses with 66.7%, with 50% for Indicator 3, and a lowly 20.8% for Indicator 4. The very few responses of “irrelevant” included 12.5% for Indictor 1, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 8.3% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, is listed below. These indicators showed a much higher response to the choice of “relevant” than to “irrelevant.” Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 33.3% of the respondents, with 50% for Indicator 2, and 54.2% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 8.4% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, is listed below. The responses were fairly consistent across all four indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 33.3% of the respondents, with 33.3% for Indicator 2, 29.2% for Indicator

3, and 41.7% for Indicator 4. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 through 4 was generally low at 0% for Indicator 1 and 2, 8.4% for Indicator 3, and 4.2% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by 41.7% of the respondents, with 58.3% for Indicator 2, and a strong 70.3% for Indicator 3. The few responses of “irrelevant” were 4.2% for Indictor 1, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, is listed below. The responses were not generally positive to this indicator. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by only 12.5% of the respondents, with 16.7% for Indicator 2, and 8.4% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” for Indictor 1 was answered as 37.5%, with 41.7% for Indicator 2, and 25% for Indicator 3.

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School A to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by only 45.8% of the respondents, but a stronger response was measured for the other indicators of the Correlate. Indicator 2 measured 75%, with 75% for Indicator 3, and 79.2% for Indicator 4. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 was answered as 54.2%, the highest of the other indicators, as expected due to its lowest rating for ”relevant” or “sometimes.” Indicator 2 received a summary response of 25% for “irrelevant” or “seldom,” 25% for Indicator 3 and 20.9% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. The responses were generally positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by an overwhelming 91.6% of the respondents, with 75% for Indicator 2, 66.7% for Indicator 3, 70.9% for Indicator 4, 75% for Indicator 5 and 41.6% for Indicator 6, the lowest. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 8.4%, with 25% for Indicator 2, 33.3% for Indicator 3, 29.1% for Indicator 4, 25% for Indicator 5, and 58.4% for Indicator 6.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 54.2% of the respondents, with a very strong 87.5% for Indicator 2, also strong 79.2% for Indicator 3, and 66.6% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 was answered as 45.8%, with a much lower 12.5% for Indicator 2, 20.8% for Indicator 3, and 33.4% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, was very positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by 87.5% of the respondents, with 87.5% for Indicator 2, and 75% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 was answered as 12.5%, with 12.5% for Indicator 2, and 25% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, was overall very positive, especially the first 2 indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by an

overwhelming 91.6% of the respondents, with 91.6% for Indicator 2, 70.9% for Indicator 3, and 79.2% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 8.4%, with 8.4% for Indicator 2, 29.1% for Indicator 3, and 20.8% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School A to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, was generally positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 70.9% of the respondents, with 75% for Indicator 2, and 83.3% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 29.1%, with 25% for Indicator 2, and 16.7% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, was generally considered of low relevance. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 33.3% of the respondents, with only 25% for Indicator 2, and a better 45.9% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 66.7%, with 75% for Indicator 2, and 54.1% for Indicator 3.

Table 4.5

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of School B Respondents to the Correlate Indicators

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all shareholders.								
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19.0	5	23.8
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.								
School B	7	33.3	6	28.6	4	19.0	4	19.0
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
School B	8	38.1	5	23.8	5	23.8	3	14.3
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.								
School B	10	47.6	1	4.8	7	33.3	3	14..3

Table 4.5 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
School B	13	61.9	5	23.8	3	14.3	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.								
School B	13	61.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	0	0.0
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.								
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	6	28.6	1	4.8
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.								
School B	10	47.6	3	14.3	8	38.1	0	0.0
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.								
School B	6	28.6	6	28.6	8	38.1	1	4.8

Table 4.5 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
School B	5	23.8	9	42.9	5	23.8	2	9.5
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
School B	14	66.7	4	19.0	3	14.3	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.								
School B	6	28.6	12	57.1	3	14.3	0	0.0
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavioral progress.								
School B	6	28.6	9	42.9	4	19.0	2	9.5

Correlate D: High Expectations for All								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
School B	2	9.5	13	61.9	6	28.6	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
School B	5	23.8	13	61.9	3	14.3	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
School B	15	71.4	3	14.3	3	14.3	0	0.0

Table 4.5 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.								
School B	3	14.3	14	66.7	3	14.3	1	4.8
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.								
School B	4	19.0	14	66.7	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
School B	7	33.3	10	47.6	2	9.5	2	9.5
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
School B	8	38.1	8	38.1	4	19.0	1	4.8

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
School B	9	42.9	3	14.3	7	33.3	2	9.5
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
School B	10	47.6	4	19.0	7	33.3	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
School B	12	57.1	3	14.3	6	28.6	0	0.0

Table 4.5 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
School B	3	14.3	5	23.8	5	23.8	8	38.1
Indicator 2; Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
School B	5	23.8	1	4.8	10	47.6	5	23.8
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.								
School B	6	28.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	6	28.6

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School B to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. The results show a generally positive response. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by approximately 42.8% of the respondents, with 33.3% for Indicator 2, 38.1% for Indicator 3, and 47.6% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indicator 1 was answered as a surprising 23.8%, with 19.1 % for Indicator 2, 14.3% for Indicator 3, and 14.3% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. These responses show a more positive response than for Correlate A, immediately above. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by the same percentage, 61.9%, as for the next two indicators, 61.9% for Indicator 2, and 61.9% for Indicator 3. The response dropped for the next indicators responding with 23.8% for Indicator 4, 47.6% for Indicator 5, and 28.5% for Indicator 6. The response of

"irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 4.8%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, 4.8% for Indicator 4, 0% for Indicator 5, and 4.8% for Indicator 6.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School B to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by approximately 23.8% of the respondents, with a much higher 66.6% for Indicator 2, and identical 28.5% for Indicator 3 and 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 9.5%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 9.5% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, is listed below. The first indicator responses were barely positive as Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by only 9.5% of the respondents, with 23.8% for Indicator 2, and 71.4% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School B to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by only 14.3% of the respondents, with 19.1% for Indicator 2, climbing to 33.3% for Indicator 3, and 38.1% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 4.8%, with an identical 4.8% for Indicator 2, 9.5% for Indicator 3, and 4.8% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, is listed below. The responses were generally positive with Indicator 1 answered as "relevant" by approximately 42.8% of the

respondents, with 47.6% for Indicator 2, and 57.1% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 9.5%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School B to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, is listed below. The balance of response to these indicators leaned toward the negative response. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by only 14.3% of the respondents, with 23.8% for Indicator 2, and 28.5% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1was answered as 38.1%, with 23.8% for Indicator 2, and 28.5% for Indicator 3.

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School B to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. The indicators were mildly positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by an ambivalent 52.4% of the respondents, with 61.8% for Indicator 2, 61 9% for Indicator 3, and 52.4% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 was answered as 47.6%, with 38.2 % for Indicator 2, 38.1% for Indicator 3, and 47.6% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. These indicators received a generally more positive response from the teachers. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by 85.7% of the respondents, with 85.7% for Indicator 2, 76.2% for Indicator 3, 66.6% for Indicator 4, 61.9% for Indicator 5, and 57% for Indicator 6. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as only 14.3%, with

14.3% for Indicator 2, 23.8% for Indicator 3, 33.4% for Indicator 4, 38.1% for Indicator 5, and a larger 43% for Indicator 6.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School B to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 66.6% of the respondents, growing to 85.7% for Indicator 2, 85.7% for Indicator 3 and a still strong 71.3% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 34%, with 14.3% for Indicator 2, 14.3% for Indicator 3, and 28.7% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, is listed below. The teachers gave a positive response to all three indicators. Above, Indicator 1 received a lukewarm response as "relevant" but when "sometimes" is added to the count the percent of response ranks near the other indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 71.5% of the respondents, with 85.7% for Indicator 2, and 85.7% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 28.5%, with 14.3% for Indicator 2, and 14.3% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School B to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, is listed below. The teachers responded quite positively to these indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 80.9% of the respondents, with 85.7% for Indicator 2, 80.9% for Indicator 3, and 76.1% for Indicator 4. The response of

“irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indictor 1 was answered as 19.1%, with 14.3% for Indicator 2, 19.1% for Indicator 3, and 23.9% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by a measured 57.2% of the respondents, with 66.7% for Indicator 2, and a stronger 71.5% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indictor 1 was answered as 42.8%, with 33.3% for Indicator 2, and 28.5% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School B to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by a mediocre 38.1% of the respondents, with even less for Indicator 2, 28.6%, and 42.9% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indictor 1 was answered as 61.9%, with 71.4% for Indicator 2, and 57.1% for Indicator 3.

Table 4.6

Summary of the Frequencies and Percentages of School C Respondents to the Correlate Indicators

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.								
School C	9	42.9	3	14.3	5	23.8	4	19.0
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted								
School C	10	47.6	6	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.								
School C	10	47.6	6	28.6	4	19.0	1	4.8
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.								
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8

Table 4.6 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.								
School C	18	85.7	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	4.8
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.								
School C	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.								
School C	12	57.1	6	28.6	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.								
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	4	19.0	2	9.5
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and help students achieve them.								
School C	12	57.1	4	19.0	4	19.0	1	4.8
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.								
School C	5	23.8	2	9.5	8	38.4	6	28.6

Table 4.6 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.								
School C	9	42.9	0	0.0	10	47.6	2	9.5
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.								
School C	15	71.4	3	14.3	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.								
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavior progress.								
School C	3	13.3	7	33.3	9	42.9	2	9.5

Correlate D: High Expectations for All								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.								
School C	10	47.6	5	23.8	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.								
School C	7	33.3	8	38.1	4	19.0	2	9.5
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.								
School C	16	76.2	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	9.5

Table 4.6 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning process and methods.								
School C	10	47.6	4	19.0	2	33.3.	0	0.0
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.								
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3.	1	4.8
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.								
School C	10	47.6	3	14.3	6	28.6	2	9.5
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.								
School C	12	57.1	4	19.0	3	14.3	2	9.5

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.								
School C	13	61.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.								
School C	13	61.9	2	9.5	5	23.8	1	4.8
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.								
School C	16	76.2	3	14.3	1	4.8	1	4.8

Table 4.6 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations								
	Relevant		Sometimes		Seldom		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunity for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.								
School C	4	19.0	7	33.3	5	23.8	5	23.8
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.								
School C	2	9.5	8	38.1	5	23.8	6	28.6
Indicator 3" The district encourages citizens and business to work with the school.								
School C	5	23.8	9	42.9	3	14.3	4	19.0

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School C to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by 42.8% of the respondents, with a 47.6% for Indicator 2, an identical 47.6% for Indicator 3 and growing to 76.1% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indicator 1 was answered as 14.3%, declining to 4.8% for Indicator 2, another identical 4.8% for Indicator 3, and 4.8% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. With the exception of Indicator 6, all the indicators received a generally positive response. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by an overwhelming 85.7% of the respondents, with 61.9% for Indicator 2, 57.1% for Indicator 3, 47.6% for Indicator 4, 61.9% for Indicator 5, and 23.8% for Indicator 6. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 4.8%, with 4.8% for Indicator 2,

4.8% for Indicator 3, 9.5% for Indicator 4, 4.8% for Indicator 5, and 28.5% for Indicator 6, which received more "irrelevant" responses than "relevant."

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, is listed below. This Correlate also contained an indicator (four) that received nearly the same "relevant" responses as "irrelevant." Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by 42.8% of the respondents, with 71.4% for Indicator 2, 61.9% for Indicator 3, and 14.3% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 9.5%, with 4.8% for Indicator 2, 4.8% for Indicator 3, and 9.5% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, is listed below. The responses were generally positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by 47.6% of the respondents, with 33.3% for Indicator 2, and 76.1% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 4.8%, with 9.5% for Indicator 2, and 9.5% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, is listed below. There was a strikingly similar response to the first three indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" by 47.6% of the respondents, also 47.6% for Indicator 2, 47.6% for Indicator 3, and 57.1% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" for Indictor 1 was answered as 0%, with 4.8% for Indicator 2, 9.5% for Indicator 3, and 9.5% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, is listed below. The responses were quite

positive. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by 61.9% of the respondents, with 57.1% for Indicator 2, and 71.4% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” for Indictor 1 was answered as 4.8%, with 4.8% for Indicator 2, and 4.8% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, is listed below. The responses were generally not positive. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by 19.1% of the respondents, with only 9.5% for Indicator 2, and 23.8% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” for Indictor 1 was answered as 23.8%, with 28.5% for Indicator 2, and 19.1% for Indicator 3, the only indicator receiving more “relevant” responses than “irrelevant” ones.

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from School C to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by a majority 57.2% of the respondents, with a higher 61.9% for Indicator 2, even higher 76.1% for Indicator 3, and an overwhelming 90.4% for Indicator 4. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 was answered as 42.8%, and declining with 38.1 % for Indicator 2, 23.9% for Indicator 3, and 9.6% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by an overwhelming 90.4% of the respondents, with 85.7% for Indicator 2, 85.6% for Indicator 3, 71.4% for Indicator 4, 76.2% for Indicator 5, and only 33.3% for Indicator 6. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indictor 1 was answered as 9.6%, with 14.3% for Indicator 2, 14.4% for Indicator 3, 28.6% for Indicator 4, 23.8%

for Indicator 5, and 66.7% for Indicator 6, the only indicator in this Correlate to receive more somewhat negative responses than positive ones.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by only 42.8% of the respondents, with a positive 85.7% for Indicator 2, 71.4% for Indicator 3, and a less than majority 47.6% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 57.2%, with 14.3% for Indicator 2, 28.6% for Indicator 3, and 52.4% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, is listed below. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by a strong 71.4% of the respondents, an identical 71.4% for Indicator 2, and a very strong 80.9% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 28.6%, with 28.6% for Indicator 2, and 19.1% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, is listed below. These four indicators received a similar response of approximately two-thirds to three-fourths positive. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by 66.7% of the respondents, with 61.9% for Indicator 2, 61.9% for Indicator 3, and 76.2% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 33.3%, with 38.1% for Indicator 2, 38.1% for Indicator 3, and 23.8% for Indicator 4.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, is listed below. The teachers at this school responded very positively to these indicators. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by 85.7% of the respondents, with an even larger 90.5% for Indicator 2, and still nearly three-fourths response for 71.5% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indictor 1 was answered as 14.3%, with 28.6% for Indicator 2, and 9.6% for Indicator 3.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents of School C to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, is listed below. Response to Indicator 1 was equivocal. Indicator 1 was answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by 52.4% of the respondents, with almost the same indecision with 47.6% for Indicator 2, and a more positive 66.6% for Indicator 3. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 was answered as 47.6%, with 52.4% for Indicator 2, and 33.4% for Indicator 3.

Section Four

This section compares the responses of the teachers and administrators to the Effective School Correlates and their indicators.

Table 4.7

Comparison of the Percentages of the Total Respondents from the Independent Variables to the Correlates

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.				
School A, B, C	24	33.0	15	21.1
Administrators	5	100.0	0	0.0
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.				
School A, B, C	28	39.4	6	8.5
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.				
School A, B, C	32	45.1	4	5.6
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.				
School A, B, C	36	50.7	5	7.0
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0

Table 4.7 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.				
School A, B, C	48	67.6	2	2.8
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 2: The principal is visible in classrooms.				
School A, B, C	38	57.3	1	1.4
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.				
School A, B, C	38	53.5	2	2.3
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.				
School A, B, C	25	35.2	3	4.2
Administrators	3	60.0	2	40.0
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.				
School A, B, C	33	46.5	1	1.4
Administrators	5	100.0	0	0.0
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.				
School A, B, C	16	22.5	11	15.5
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0

Table 4.7 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.				
School A, B, C	24	33.8	7	9.9
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.				
School A, B, C	45	63.4	1	1.4
Administrators	5	100.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.				
School A, B, C	31	43.7	1	1.4
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavior progress.				
School A, B, C	14	19.7	6	8.5
Administrators	1	20.0	4	80.0

Correlate D: High Expectations for All	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.				
School A, B, C	20	28.2	1	1.4
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.				
School A, B, C	24	33.8	2	2.8
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in this achievement.				
School A, B, C	44	62.0	4	5.6
Administrators	5	100.0	0	0.0

Table 4.7 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task				
	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.				
School A, B, C	21	29.6	1	1.4
Administrators	2	40.0	3	60.0
Indicator 2: `Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.				
School A, B, C	22	31.0	2	2.8
Administrators	3	60.0	2	0.0
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.				
School A, B, C	24	33.8	6	8.5
Administrators	1	20.0	4	80.0
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.				
School A, B, C	30	42.3	4	5.6
Administrators	5	100.0	0	4.0

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning				
	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.				
School A, B, C	32	45.1	4	6.0
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.				
School A, B, C	37	52.1	1	1.4
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.				
School A, B, C	45	63.4	1	1.4
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0

Table 4.7 (Continued)

Correlate G	Relevant		Irrelevant	
	n	%	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.				
School A, B, C	10	14.1	22	31.0
Administrators	4	80.0	1	20.0
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.				
School A, B, C	11	15.5	21	29.6
Administrators	5	100.0	0	0.0
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.				
School A, B, C	13	18.3	16	22.5
Administrators	3	60.0	2	40.0

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from all schools to Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 33% of the teacher respondents. Administrators responded much differently with a unanimous 100% "relevant.” The responses to Indicator 2 as “relevant” were very similar between the teachers (39.4%) and administrators, responding at 40%. Indicator 3 showed a large divergence as the teachers responded as “relevant” at 45.1%, while the administrators were much more positive, responding at 80%. The teachers responded for Indicator 4 as “relevant” at 50.7% and the administrators, much more positively, responded at 80%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 21.1% by the teachers and 0% by the administrators. The responses to the remaining indicators were similar. The teachers responded with

8.5% for Indicator 2, and the administrators responded as 0% “irrelevant.” Roughly similar for Indicator 3, with a teacher response of “irrelevant” at 5.6% compared to the administrators’ response at 0%, and for Indicator 4 the teachers’ responded “irrelevant” by 7.0% against the administrators’ response at 0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 67.6% of the teacher respondents. Administrators responded a little stronger with 80% "relevant.” The teachers responded as “relevant” with 57.3% for Indicator 2, while the administrators responded more strongly at 80%. The teachers responded as “relevant” 53.5% for Indicator 3, and the administrators responded lower this time at 40%. The divergent view returned for Indicator 4 with the teachers responding as “relevant” at 35.2% against the administrators’ responses almost twice as positive at 60%. The response by the teachers for Indicator 5 was 46.5%, which the administrators more than doubled to 100%. Indicator 6 had the teachers responding as “relevant” by 22.5% and the administrators were 0%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 2.8% by the teachers and 0% by the administrators. Indicator 2 received very similar responses at 1.4% by the teachers with the administrators closely responded 0% “irrelevant.” The gap was slightly larger for Indicator 3 where the teachers responded 2.3%” irrelevant” against the administrators 0% response. The teachers responded 4.2% “irrelevant” for Indicator 4 against the administrators 0% response. The response by the teachers for Indicator 5 was 1.4% “irrelevant” and the administrators similarly at 0%. Indicator 6 was 15.5% “irrelevant” and the administrators were slightly higher at 20.0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 33.8% of the teacher respondents. Administrators responded about evenly with 40% "relevant.” Teachers responded 63.4% for Indicator 2 as “relevant” against the administrators’ responses at 100%. Teachers responded 43.7% for Indicator 3 as “relevant” and the administrators responded similarly at 40%. Also, the teachers responded at 19.7% for Indicator 4 being “relevant” and the administrators agreed by responding at 20%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 9.9% by the teachers and 0% by the administrators. Indicator 2 was responded by the teachers at 1.4% “irrelevant” with a similar administrators’ response of 0%. Similarly, the teachers responded at a rate of 1.4% for indicator 3 being “irrelevant” against the administrators’ 0% responses. Response to Indicator 4 showed a diversion with the teachers responding at 8.5% against the administrators’ response at 0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate D: High Expectations for All, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 28.2% of the teachers. Administrators responded higher with 40% "relevant.” Indicator 2 brought a rather large diversion in responses between the teachers and the administrators. The teachers responded 33.8% that the Indicator was “relevant,” but the administrators responded at 80%. This diversion continued for Indicator 3 with the teachers responding 62% as “relevant” while the administrators responded at 100%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 1.4% by the teachers and 0% by the administrators. Teachers responded at 2.8% for Indicator 2 being “irrelevant,” while the

administrators responded at 0%. Indicator 3 had the teachers responding at 5.6% “irrelevant” compared to the administrators’ response of 0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 29.6% of the teachers while the administrators responded with 40% "relevant." A difference of opinion showed with the teachers responding with 31% for Indicator 2 “relevant” and the administrators responded at 60%. The gap narrowed for Indicator 3 with the teachers responding at 33.8% “relevant” and the administrators’ responding at 20%. The teachers responded to Indicator 4 being “relevant” by 42.3% against the administrators’ 100% response. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 1.4% by the teachers and 0% by the administrators. The teachers responded at 2.8% for Indicator 2 being “relevant” and the administrators responded at 0%. Indicator 3 called up an 8.5% “relevant” response from the teachers against the administrator’s response at 0%. Finally, the teachers responded at 5.6% being “relevant” for Indicator 4 compared to the administrators’ response at 0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 45.1% of the teachers. Administrators almost doubled their response with 80% "relevant." Teachers responded 52.1% for Indicator 2 as “relevant,” while the administrators responded more positively at 80%. Again, the teachers were less positive responding to Indicator 3 at 63.4% as “relevant” compared to the administrators’ response at 80%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 6% by

the teachers, but a larger 20% by the administrators. The responses to Indicator 2 were closer between the teachers and administrators. The teachers answered as “irrelevant” 1.4% and the administrators responded at 0%. Similarly, the 1.4% of the teachers answered as “irrelevant” for Indicator 3 and the administrators responded at 0%.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, Indicator 1 was answered as “relevant” by approximately 14.1% of the teachers. Administrators responded with 0% "relevant.” The teacher and administrator gap was slightly higher with 15.5% of the teachers responding to Indicator 2 as “relevant” against the administrators’ response at 0%. The teachers responded to Indicator 3 at a rate of 18.3% for “relevant” against a two-thirds larger response by the administrators, who responded at 60%. The response of “irrelevant” for Indicator 1 was answered as 31% by the teachers, yet 0% by the administrators. Similarly, responses to Indicator 2 showed a similar gulf between the teachers and the administrators, with 29.6% of the teachers indicating “irrelevant” compared to 0% by the administrators. Again similar, the teachers responded 22.5% for Indicator 3 as “irrelevant” compared to the administrators’ response at 0%.

The questions of the survey were then reviewed and related to the mean of the responses in Table 4.7. Due to divergent population size of the groups, Schools A, B, and C as compared to administrators, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used. This is a nonparametric test equivalent to ANOVA. None of the Kruskal-Wallis results Chi-Square p values were significant at the .05 level. This indicates that the sum of the ranks for the four groups for each of the items was not significantly different from each other.

Table 4.8

Comparison of the Mean Rank of the Total Respondents from the Independent Variables to the Correlates

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: The school has a mission statement developed with input from all		
School A	24	41.2
School B	21	35.9
School C	21	35.2
Administrators	5	15.0
Total	71	
Indicator 2: The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.		
School A	24	32.9
School B	21	39.9
School C	21	34.8
Administrators	5	39.8
Total	71	
Indicator 3: The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.		
School A	24	33.2
School B	21	41.9
School C	21	36.3
Administrators	5	23.7
Total	71	
Indicator 4: An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.		
School A	24	39.3
School B	21	42.1
School C	21	28.6
Administrators	5	25.9
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.		
School A	24	36.5
School B	21	40.1
School C	21	32.1
Administrators	5	32.9
Total	71	
Indicator 2: The principal is visible I classrooms.		
School A	24	40.1
School B	21	34.6
School C	21	34.9
Administrators	5	27.3
Total	71	
Indicator 3: The principal monitors student progress.		
School A	24	38.3
School B	21	34.4
School C	21	34.7
Administrators	5	37
Total	71	
Indicator 4: The principal limits interruptions of class.		
School A	24	35.8
School B	21	40.7
School C	21	34.3
Total	71	
Indicator 5: Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them.		
School A	24	37.6
School B	21	39.2
School C	21	34.9
Administrators	5	19.5
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership		
Indicator 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.		
School A	24	36.0
School B	21	29.1
School C	21	39.9
Administrators	5	48.7
Total	71	

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.		
School A	24	36.0
School B	21	36.9
School C	21	37.5
Administrators	5	25.8
Total	71	
Indicator 2: Students are given regular feedback on their performance.		
School A	24	37.1
School B	21	37.3
School C	21	36.0
Administrators	5	25.5
Total	71	
Indicator 3: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.		
School A	24	35.1
School B	21	40.0
School C	21	33.5
Administrators	5	34.1
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress		
Indicator 4: Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavior progress.		
School A	24	34.9
School B	21	32.1
School C	21	41.2
Administrators	5	35.6
Total	71	

Correlate D: High Expectations for All		
	n	Mean Rank %
Indicator 1: Teachers involve all students in the instruction process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.		
School A	24	33.2
School B	21	43.7
School C	21	33.4
Administrators	5	28.3
Total	71	
Indicator 2: Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students		
School A	24	31.8
School B	21	39.9
School C	21	40.6
Administrators	5	20.4
Total	71	
Indicator 3: Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement.		
School A	24	41.1
School B	21	34.6
School C	21	34.2
Administrators	5	25
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.		
School A	24	33.3
School B	21	41.6
School C	21	35.0
Administrators	5	29.4
Total	71	
Indicator 2: Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.		
School A	24	34.4
School B	21	39.2
School C	21	36.4
Administrators	5	28.6
Total	71	
Indicator 3: Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.		
School A	24	37.4
School B	21	34.5
School C	21	34.7
Administrators	5	41.0
Total	71	
Indicator 4: Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.		
School A	24	38.0
School B	21	39.5
School C	21	34.5
Administrators	5	18.0
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.		
School A	24	38.2
School B	21	40.5
School C	21	30.8
Administrators	5	28.6
Total	71	
Indicator 2: Students are accountable for good citizenship.		
School A	24	35.5
School B	21	39.5
School C	21	35.5
Administrators	5	26.2
Total	71	
Indicator 3: The school is a safe and secure place to be.		
School A	24	35.4
School B	21	40.6
School C	21	33.3
Administrators	5	30.9
Total	71	

Table 4.8 (Continued)

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations		
		Mean Rank
	n	%
Indicator 1: The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.		
School A	24	39.6
School B	21	38.5
School C	21	32.1
Administrators	5	24.9
Total	71	
Indicator 2: Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.		
School A	24	41.0
School B	21	35.5
School C	21	34.7
Administrators	5	19.5
Total	71	
Indicator 3: The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.		
School A	24	40.6
School B	21	37.9
School C	21	32.6
Administrators	5	20.0
Total	71	

Section Five

Summarizing the three research questions: To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas? To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School

Teachers in Harris County, Texas? How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County, Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system? The results indicated that both groups reflect the same basic responses. Correlates A-F were revealed to have a strong indication that they were considered "relevant" and "sometimes relevant." Correlate G was revealed by the two groups to show a strong indication that the Correlate is "seldom" or "irrelevant."

Research question three, which asked for a rewrite by the respondents of any Correlates that were "irrelevant," was not successful. There was insufficient response by the two groups in regard to this question.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to assess the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by the Teachers and Administrators in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

Secondly, the study was to be used to suggest modifications to the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to an alternative educational setting for students in the correctional system in selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas.

The results of the study are discussed in further detail, and conclusions and implications are drawn that suggest how the results of the study contribute to the current body of knowledge related to the Effective School Research model and its applications to alternative Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas.

Method

A survey research methodology was used for gathering and reporting data in this inquiry. The purpose of the research is to provide a systematic and accurate description of facts and characteristics of the population of interest. Quantitative data were obtained using basic questionnaire techniques outlined in *Educational Research: An Introduction* (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

This inquiry's purposes were to answer all three of the research questions:

Research Question #1

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

Research Question #2

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in the correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

Research Question #3

How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County, Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system?

Procedures

The researcher reviewed different methodologies with his chair, Dr. David Erlandson. Development of the survey was in conjunction with Dr. Erlandson and consultation was also sought from a selected committee of practitioners in the field of correctional education. Members of the doctoral committee judged the survey as satisfactory.

The researcher sent a copy of the proposal and a cover letter to the Director of The Brown Schools of Harris County requesting permission to conduct the study and to gather research information. A copy of the letter requesting permission is in Appendix A.

A formal meeting was held with the Director of The Brown Schools of Harris County and a full explanation of the study given.

Staff information was requested from the personnel office of The Brown Schools in relation to the three charter schools and names, mailing addresses, e-mail addresses, phone numbers, and job classification were received.

The procedure for completion of the survey included a packet that was mailed to the teachers' and administrators' attention for their completion. The packet included a cover letter explaining the proposed study, which is in Appendix B; a cover letter from the Director of the Charter Schools, which is in Appendix C; the questionnaire, which is in Appendix D; and a self-addressed stamped envelope to facilitate ease of return to the researcher. The participants were told that their responses were confidential, that they could refuse to participate in the study, and that the instrument would take approximately 30 minutes or less to complete.

Follow-up mailings were sent out in order to obtain a return rate of 80%, the amount considered to be the minimum acceptable rate. Approximately one month after the initial mailing, an additional mail-out was sent to non-respondents. Within two weeks of the second mail-out, a phone call or email reminder from the researcher was conducted and an interview or submission of responses by email was offered. The process was repeated for completion of the additional questionnaire in a third and final mail-out one month later.

Demographic Data

The demographic data from this study indicated that some similarities existed among the respondents. Most of the respondents to the survey were Teachers, with a percentage of 93%. Administrators made up 7% of the respondents.

Research Question #1

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

This question was addressed in the study by looking at the responses on the survey. To answer the research question, the seven Effective School Correlates with their twenty-seven Indicators were used in a written questionnaire. Administrators were asked to respond to the questionnaire and rate the Correlate Indicators as to whether they were "relevant," "sometimes," "seldom," or "irrelevant" to the alternative educational system. These responses to the question are summarized in Table 4.2. The results reveal a strong indication that the Correlates are relevant, but sometimes relevant with some exceptions.

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, Indicator 1, were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 100% of the respondents, with 40% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3, and 100% for Indicator 4. The response of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 were answered as 0%, with 60% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 0% for Indicator 4.

Administrator respondents revealed that Indicator 2 in Research Question #1 Correlate A was not considered "relevant" or "sometimes." Sixty percent responded that this particular Indicator 2, *the mission statement, states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum,* was "seldom" or "irrelevant." The lack of support for Indicator 2 seems to imply that, while the mission statement has been developed with input from all stakeholders and is evident in school routine and planning the application that all children can learn the adopted curriculum is either not present in the mission statements or possibly not accepted as relevant.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, Indicator 1, were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 100% of the respondents, with 100% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3, 100% for Indicator 4, 100% for Indicator 5, and 0% for Indicator 6. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, 0% for Indicator 4, 0% for Indicator 5, and 100% for Indicator 6.

Administrator respondents revealed that Indicator 6, in Research Question #1 Correlate B, was not considered "relevant" or "sometimes." One hundred percent responded that this particular Indicator 6, *the superintendent and board of education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully,* was "seldom" or "irrelevant." The lack of support for Indicator 6 seems to imply that the superintendent and board of education are actively involved to make the instructional program work

successfully, is either not present in instructional leadership or possibly not accepted as relevant.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, Indicator 1 were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 100% of the respondents, with 100% for Indicator 2, 100% for Indicator 3, and 60% for Indicator 4. The responses of "irrelevant" for Indicator 1 were answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, 0% for Indicator 3, and 60% for Indicator 4. The data imply that the administrators supported this Correlate and its Indicators.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate D: High Expectations for All, Indicator 1, were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 100% of the respondents, with 100% for Indicator 2, and 100% for Indicator 3. The responses of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 were answered as 0%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the Administrators support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, Indicator 1, were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 100% of the respondents, with 80% for Indicator 2, 60% for Indicator 3, and 100% for Indicator 4. The responses of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 were answered as 0%, with 20% for Indicator 2, 40% for Indicator 3, and 0% for Indicator 4. The data imply that the Administrators support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, Indicator 1, were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 80% of the respondents, with 100% for Indicator 2, and 100% for Indicator 3. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 20%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 0% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the administrators support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #1 Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, Indicator 1, were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 80% of the respondents, with 100% for Indicator 2, and 80% for Indicator 3. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 20%, with 0% for Indicator 2, and 20% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the Administrators support this Correlate.

Research Question #2

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

This question was addressed in the study by looking at the responses on the survey. To answer the research question, the seven Effective School Correlates with their twenty-seven Indicators were included in a written questionnaire. Teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire and rate the Correlate Indicators as to whether they were “relevant,” “sometimes,” “seldom,” or “irrelevant” to the alternative educational system.

These responses to the question are summarized in Table 4.3. The results reveal a strong indication that the Correlates are relevant and sometimes relevant with some exceptions.

Overall, Teachers in all three schools responded to Research Question #2 Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, Indicator 1, were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 53.1% of the respondents, with 67% for Indicator 2, 71.2% for Indicator 3, and 3.2% for Indicator 4. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 46.9%, with 33% for Indicator 2, 28.8% for Indicator 3, and 25.8% for Indicator 4. The data imply that the Teachers support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, Indicator 1, were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 89% of the respondents, with 90.1% for Indicator 2, 75.7% for Indicator 3, 68.2% for Indicator 4, 69.7% for Indicator 5, and 40.8% for Indicator 6. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 11%, with 8.9% for Indicator 2, 24.3% for Indicator 3, 31.8% for Indicator 4, 30.3% for Indicator 5, and 59.2% for Indicator 6.

Teacher respondents revealed that Indicator 6 in Research Question #2 Correlate B was not considered "relevant" or "sometimes." One hundred percent responded that this particular Indicator, *the superintendent and board of education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully,* was "seldom" or "irrelevant." The lack of support for Indicator 6 seems to imply that, while instructional leadership is supported through the principal and teachers’ planning meetings, the principal visible in

the classrooms, success in monitoring, limiting interruptions, and teacher and administrators establishing academic benchmarks the support of the superintendent and board of education is extremely weak. The lack of support to the Indicator that the superintendent and board of education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully is either not present in instructional leadership, or possibly not accepted as relevant. This response is in direct agreement with administrator responses.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, Indicator 1, were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 54.5% of the respondents, with 86.4% for Indicator 2, 78.8% for Indicator 3, and 62.2% for Indicator 4. The responses of "irrelevant" for Indicator 1 were answered as 45.5%, with 13.6% for Indicator 2, 21.2% for Indicator 3, and 37.8% for Indicator 4. The data imply that the Teachers supported this Correlate and its Indicators.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate D: High Expectations for All, Indicator 1 were answered as "relevant" or "sometimes" by approximately 77.3% of the respondents, with 81.9% for Indicator 2, and 86.9% for Indicator 3. The responses of "irrelevant" or "seldom" for Indicator 1 were answered as 22.7%, with 18.1% for Indicator 2, and 13.1% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the Teachers support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate E: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task, Indicator 1, were answered

as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 80.4% of the respondents, with 78.8% for Indicator 2, 71.2% for Indicator 3, and 77.3% for Indicator 4. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 19.6%, with 21.2% for Indicator 2, 28.8% for Indicator 3, and 22.7% for Indicator 4. The data imply that the Teachers support this Correlate.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, Indicator 1 were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 71.5% of the respondents, with 71.2% for Indicator 2, and 73.2% for Indicator 3. The response of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1, were answered as 28.5%, with 28.8% for Indicator 2, and 18.2% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the Teachers support this Correlate

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents to Research Question #2 Correlate G: Positive Home School Relations, Indicator 1 were answered as “relevant” or “sometimes” by approximately 41% of the respondents, with 33.4% for Indicator 2, and 54.7% for Indicator 3. The responses of “irrelevant” or “seldom” for Indicator 1 were answered as 59%, with 66.6% for Indicator 2, and 45.3% for Indicator 3. The data imply that the administrators support this Correlate.

Teacher responses reveal that Indicator 1 and Indicator 2 in Research Question #2 Correlate G were not considered "relevant" or "sometimes." Fifty-nine percent responded that this particular Indicator 1, *the school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems,* and 2, *parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are*

actively involved in helping make decisions, "seldom" or "irrelevant." The lack of support for Indicators 1 and 2 seems to imply that, while positive home and school relations are important, it is either not present in home and school relations or possibly not accepted as relevant.

Research Question #3

How would Charter School Teachers and Administrators in Harris County, Texas modify the Effective School Correlates to make them relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system?

This question was not answered due to the lack of response by the participants.

Conclusions

The effort to reform schools and apply Effective School Research has been ongoing since the early 1960s. The federal paper written by Dr. James Coleman, which concluded that public schools didn't make a significant difference, created the impetus for this reform movement. The publication of the National Commission on Excellence in Education entitled, *A Nation at Risk,* continued to fuel the debates well into the 1990s.

The challenge of the Coleman paper by Dr. Ronald Edmonds, then the Director of the Center for Urban Studies at Harvard University, and further research by Dr. Wilber Brookover and Dr. Lawrence Lezotte, brought Effective School Research to the forefront of the debate. Their research indicated that schools did make a significant difference. Since both groups represented opposing points of view, in relation to the effectiveness of public schools, the debate has been both heated and intensely studied.

Research Question #1

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Administrators in Harris County, Texas?

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, indicated an over all relevance. The respondents seem to agree with what present research concludes except in the belief that all children can learn. This lack of support for indicator 2 is at the very heart of Effective School Research and application. While the respondents believed in a mission statement, they failed to support the mission statement in its present written form.

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in Florida schools, gave a clear definition, as described by the San Diego County schools and accepted by the Florida schools. The clear and focused mission must be clearly articulated statements that are academically focused. These statements must describe high expectations, what the students are to learn, and skills to master. The authors further explained that the school district felt it was important that the clear and focused mission must also be communicated to all staff, students, and parents. The instruction and curriculum materials must be aligned to the mission. The authors cite Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990), who described the clear and focused mission as clearly articulated with a staff that understands and is committed to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability.

Murray (1995), in a paper presented to the Eastern Educational Research Association that explained the parent perception of Effective Schools, had this definition. He shared the views of Edmonds (1979), Rosenshine (1983), Venesky and Winfield (1979), and Kemp and Hall (1992). He stated that all of these writers have identified the importance of planning, defining, prioritizing goals and objectives, and organizing content to facilitate optimal students success. He further said that Brookover and Lezotte (1979), as well as Lawrence, Baker, Hansen, and Elsi (1974), stressed the importance of appropriate curriculum planning and teacher promotion of common purpose. Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995) in reviewing present literature indicated these findings: "Both School Effectiveness Research and evaluations of school improvement programs show that consensus on the values and goals of the school are associated with improved educational outcomes . . ." (p. 11). Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore also indicated that an article by Cohen (1983) showed the importance of clear, public, and agreed upon instructional goals.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, indicated variable responses. While there was significant, acceptance as relevant to indicators 1, and 2, indicators 3 and 4 were not as strong and indictor 6 was responded to as seldom to irrelevant. Again, the response by the administrators seems to imply a weakness in acceptance of this correlate as written.

Present research indicates the need for a strong instructional leader. While this is the present accepted norm due to the research Dr. Larry Lazotte in a recent statement in

Phoenix, Arizona (2006) said, “my present feeling on this correlate are that we have added too much responsibility to the building principal. I now concur with some of my other colleagues that the modern principal must have additional help to accomplish the present tasks. The present configuration of the principal is no longer acceptable.”

The following research still accepts the need of the principal to be the overall instructional leader yet with some reservation. A paper by Ruth Ash and Maurice Persall (2004), both professors at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, discussed the idea that the modern principal is the Chief Learning Officer. In the paper, the two professors stressed the importance of the new direction of the local school principal. They suggested that in this new era of education, the building principal will enhance the quality of thinking of those within the organization rather than edicts or directives. They wrote that this will be possible by creating learning opportunities that will enable the staff and the faculty to become leaders themselves. The authors then go on to say that the old adage of, ‘Doing things right,’ rather than, ‘Doing the right thing,’ will be more highly valued. They do stress, however, that at the present time most of our modern schools were designed instructionally and managerially in the nineteenth century. “The schools of yesterday and today are not the kind of schools we need for tomorrow” (p. 2). In a slight twist to the Deming direction of management, the two professors listed the following as important functions of an effective principal for the new schools of tomorrow. They suggested that the modern formative leader will: Create team learning, productive thinking, and collaborative problem solving; teachers will be viewed as leaders and school principals as leaders of leaders; trust should drive working

relationships and the job of the leader will be to drive out fear; leaders will move from demanding conformity and compliance to encouraging and supporting innovation and creativity; the leader will focus on people and processes; leaders will be customer-focused and servant-based; leaders will create networks that foster two-way communication; formative leadership will require proximity, visibility, and being close to the customer; leaders will empower the people within the school to do the work without interference; and, finally, the leader will be able to operate in an environment of uncertainty, constantly learning how to exploit systemic change, rather than maintaining the status quo. Later in the article, they quoted Stanley Davis from his book *2001 Management*. This quote is very important as we review the Effective School principal, "Many years ago I asked an executive responsible for the future development of a very large corporation, What do you worry about most on your job?" His answer was startling, "I worry most about what my people don't know they don't know. What they know they don't know they're able to work on and find the answer to. But they can't do that if they don't know they don't know." The authors went on to express their view that the principal of the future will need to be able to approach the future by understanding predictions and scenario planning. The effective instructional leader will need to be aware of emerging trends in society in order to structure curricular and instructional strategies that will properly prepare students.

Michael Fullan (2002) expressed the view that, "Characterizing instructional leadership as the principal's central role has been a valuable first step in increasing student learning" (p. 17). However, he went on to stress that we have not gone far

enough. He says that our effective leaders must be able to change the learning cultures of schools and transform the teaching profession itself. He accepts that the best examples of success are represented by the accomplishments at the effective level-high performance standards with corresponding results. He expressed the belief that they do not go deep enough and that only lasting reforms implemented by the executive leaders will create enduring greatness. He goes on to say that creating and sharing knowledge is central to effective leadership, but then strongly suggests that within the cultures of change the leader must be committed to develop and share that knowledge. "An organization cannot flourish-at least, not for long-on the actions of the top leader alone. Schools and districts need many leaders at many levels" (p. 19).

John Evers and Trudy Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in relation to the principal, gave a clear definition, as described by the San Diego County Schools. In Effective Schools, principals will demonstrate strong leadership in: curriculum and instruction, communication of the mission and goals, monitoring of progress of both pupils and programs, setting high expectations for students and staff, protecting instructional time, proper use of the skills of the teaching staff, and plans for staff growth and development. The authors indicated that the researchers Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990) all wrote that the principal in an Effective School will persistently communicate the mission to parents, staff, and students. These three authors also said that application of the characteristics of instructional effectiveness and management of instructional programs will also be observable.

Larry Lashway (2000), in a recent review of articles about effective principals, said that traditionally principals have been accountable for doing their jobs well. He went on to suggest that in the past principals were responsible for treating teachers fairly, listening to parents, exercising instructional leadership, and staying within the budget. The present is demanding not only the above, but also high student achievement. Lashway further contended that the new principals will need to balance autonomy and central authority issues. The new direction will need to be facilitative rather than directive. The instructional leader will also need to understand the two environments in which student performance thrives: classroom environment (student teacher interaction) and successful instructional strategies (organization). Owings and Kaplan (2000) suggested that a major responsibility of the principal as instructional leader is to increase student ownership and investment in their schoolwork. He said that Hill and Crevola (1999) explain this is done by teachers using research-supported instructional best practices that actively engage all students in the learning process. What Darling-Hammond (1999) and Wasley (1999) referred to as the teachers' repertoire of teaching techniques: ongoing instructionally-focused professional development activities, frequent classroom observations, and teacher conferences.

John Keedy (1992), in a case study of Nottingham High School and its principal, indicated that principals are "critical to school success" (p. 2). In his case study, he remarked that there is a lack of knowledge in reference to the characterization of the principalship. He even suggested that this lack of knowledge has made some observers question whether educational administration is a profession, "since we lack a codified

body of knowledge" (p. 2). He went on to say that researchers such as Guthrie, Clifford, and Colbertson have all remarked on the lack of codified knowledge. Keedy's study revealed two significant areas that seem to indicate a successful principal. One area is that the principal have the reputation for turning a school around during his tenure and the other is a significant increase in student outcomes. In the study, he also indicated a successful principal will be able to communicate the vision and mission of the school.

Dorren Schmitt (1990), who presented a paper to the Annual Meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators in New Orleans, discovered research that seemed to imply much of what Guthrie, Clifford and Colbertson indicated in the 1992 Keedy study. Schmitt remarked that two researchers, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) discovered after a three-year study of California schools that the very nature and differences of public schools require a highly diversified and changeable instructional leader.

Richard DuFour (2002) stated that, "Educators are gradually redefining the role of the principal from instructional leaders with a focus on teaching to the leader of a professional community with a focus on learning" (p. 15).

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, indicated variable responses. While there was significant, acceptance as relevant to indicators 1, and 2, which were focuses on the students. Indicators 3 and 4 were not as strong and indictor 4 was responded to as sometimes to seldom. These responses are of particular significance due to their direct focus on the parents. It is

implied by the administrators that while communication in regards to monitoring of student progress is important the application to the students and parents are not the same.

Present research indicates the importance of all parties in regards to this Correlate. Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools, gave a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools, which was accepted by the Florida schools. Effective Schools will frequently assess student progress. The school district says this will be done by the teachers The authors stated that Lezotte (1990) and Bullard and Taylor (1993) suggested that an Effective School will use a variety of assessment procedures frequently. The results of this data will then be used to improve the instructional program.

In his 1995 survey, Murray found that monitoring of student progress was essential for student success. He remarked that it was closely aligned to curricular issues. He suggested that teachers should match the pre-defined objectives with student performance. The teachers should take the results of assessments as a way to monitor their instructional methods. He further shared that several researchers (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Cohen, 1981; Evertson, 1982) all shared the view that this was an important Effective School Correlate

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate D: High Expectations for All, indicated positive responses. The administrators agreed with present research. This response is significant due to its direct bearing on Coorelate A: Clear and Focused School Mission, indicator 2. That indicator states that all children can learn. The

response of the administrators was 60% at "seldom." This Correlate asked whether teachers believe and are involved in seeking high expectation for all. Reviewing the responses the data implies that while the administrators do not agree that all children can learn they do accept the premise that the teachers believe in seeking high expectation.

Evers and Bacon (1994) in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools gave, a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools and accepted by the Florida schools. High expectations and achievement of all is a school-wide belief structure. The school district stresses that the teachers and staff must believe that all students can obtain mastery of skills taught. The district believes that the school should use heterogeneous groupings, direct instruction, peer tutoring, cooperative learning groups, and team learning to ensure this mastery. Learning should be celebrated regularly through displays of student and staff work, awards assemblies, and other public acknowledgements. The authors cited Lezotte (1990), and Bullard and Taylor (1993), as defining high expectations as an atmosphere where the staff believes in mastery by the student and that they can teach to this level of mastery.

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995), in an exhaustive review on the characteristics of Effective Schools, had much to say on this correlate. In their review, they stressed that by this date there are many studies and articles. The data seem to indicate that an Effective School will be characterized by the desire to promote academic excellence and is emphasized by the teachers and pupils (McKill and Rigsby, 1973; Weber, 1971; Mortimore et al., 1988a; Ainsworth and Batten, 1974; Rutter et al., 1979).

In a review of articles in relation to high achievement and high expectations by Gerald Bracey (2002), the author came to this conclusion. In a study of the results of two schools in the same neighborhood, but which had differing results, the data indicated that the school with academic success was due to:

> Roosevelt teachers created an environment that was highly supportive of student learning. They acted as coaches, guiding students and structuring the task in a way that demonstrated their own investment in having students reach this goal . . . This support ultimately helped students believe that reaching the test-score cutoffs was an attainable and important goal (p. 432).

In a study by Dentler (1994), of 11 public school districts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, the correlate on high expectation was discussed. In all three of the high performing districts the teachers, "communicated higher academic expectations to their students; believe all students can learn, recognize and reward their students symbolically more often and take pride in their own instructional successes" (pp. 17-18).

Marge Scherer (2002) interviewed Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, author of *Becoming Adult: How Teenagers Prepare for the World of Work*. In Csikszentmihalyi's survey work of 1,000 students and over 30,000 written reports by these students, an interesting result was discovered. In a question, which basically was asking the students about high expectation and achievement for all on standardized test, the results were interesting. The survey results given by the students indicated that expectations for a test needed to be clear and understandable and that they were less stressful if they were.

Donald Gratz (2000), in his article on expectation related to standards, made the statement that, “All children can live up to much higher expectations and most will” (p. 682). Where we seem to weaken is in our resolve. He quoted Judy Codding and Marc Tucker:

> One of the most striking features of countries that are more successful than we in educating their students to high standards is the assumption made by parents, teachers, and the student themselves that the students can do it. By contrast, the most important obstacle to high student achievement in the United States is our low expectations for students - not just students who are poor and come from minority backgrounds, but . . . most of our students (p. 682).

In another article on high expectations for students, the author Beverly Tatum (2000) discussed her results of a two-year project that addressed racism. The project, which was funded by the Carnegie Corporation, had three components - an after-school cultural-identity-group, parent outreach workshops, and professional development courses for educators. The author designed the professional development portion of the project and the article is primarily about those results. She indicated the project was needed due to the increase of racial intolerance and hostility at all age levels. She also indicated that in the United States most teachers are white and were raised and educated in predominantly white communities; thus, they are limited to their understanding of children of color. She strongly recommended multicultural-education courses or programs. In her review of the white teachers who took her program, the underlying assumption by most of the whites were that children of color could not make the rigorous

educational expectations. It was through this program and the discovery and open communication between teachers and students that showed this was not true.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task , indicated positive responses. The administrators agreed with present research in regards to the indicators except for indicator 3. This indicator directly impacts the use of the students culture and heritage in developing positive self-concepts by the teacher. The administrators responded by 80% to "sometimes" or "seldom." The present incarceration level of Hispanic and Black juveniles within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice implies the importance of this indicator.

Present research indicates the importance of time-on task but there is a weakness in the research in the applicability of the student's culture and heritage.

In an article by Gordon Cawelti (2000), which reviewed the success of a minority school in south Texas, the data clearly indicated that, "Many children simply need more time than others to master basic skills" (p. 43). The TAAS results in Reading for 1998 showed a passing rate of 90.7% and all students passed the Writing test above the state average of 85.3%. The Math results indicated that 97.3% passed.

John Zahorik (1999), in an article that reviewed research on class size reduction, indicated that one of the main benefits of this process is to increase time on task.

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in the Florida schools gave, a clear definition, as described by San Diego County Schools, which was accepted by the Florida schools. In Effective Schools time,

on task is critical to the learning process. The district defines this as well-designed classroom operating procedures, the use of adequate time allocated for basic skills instruction, opportunities to respond, and proper use of homework. The authors cited Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990) as explaining time on task as allocation of significant amounts of classroom time, which would be dedicated to whole or large group instruction. This instruction would be teacher-directed and planned.

In an interesting article by Clifford Janey (2002), the time on task correlate is viewed entirely different. The article is about a new direction by the Rochester City School District and time needed for graduation. It suggests that we hold time constant and vary the quality of learning; while their approach suggests that we hold quality of learning constant and vary the time. Through this new approach, the high school students may enter into a pathway that will allow them to move through the school year at their own pace, and thus graduate on their own time-line.

D'Amico (2001), in his study on the achievement gap of minorities, indicated that research shows the need for smaller classrooms so the teachers will have more time on task. D'Amico indicated that several researchers (Howley, 2001; Pritchard, 1999; Stiefel et al., 2000; North Carolina Public School, 2000) recommend that reducing the number of students in school or classrooms will enable teachers more time with students, and thus increase academic learning.

Bruce Biddle and David Berliner (2002) warned that class size is, "not a panacea for education" (p. 16). In their article they shared differing views about class size and its results on minority students. While the American Federation of Teachers asserts that

there is compelling evidence that class reduction will have a positive effect on student achievement in relation to time on task, the authors shared that the Heritage Foundation and their research teams have a divergent view and did not agree with the findings of the American Federation of Teachers.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, indicated an over all relevance. The respondents seem to agree strongly with the indictors and with the present research.

Robert J. Chaskin and Diana M. Rauner (1995), in a research article on caring sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, discovered that the relationship between the students and teachers is an important one in establishing a positive safe and orderly environment. The research of David Cohen and Deborah Lowenberg Ball (2001), indicated findings along the same lines with Chaskin and Rauner. "Although many people think of instruction as what teachers do, it consists of interactions involving teachers, students, and content. The interactions occur in such varied settings as . . ."(p.75). Cohen and Ball stress that instruction takes place in a safe and orderly environment.

Dick Corbett and Bruce Wilson (2002), in an article in which they interviewed students at an inner-city school, reviewed their findings on the importance of the teacher in relation to a safe and orderly school. "According to students, their teachers varied tremendously in how well they were able to control students, and the one who could not maintain control bothered them a lot" (p. 19).

John Holloway (2002), in a review of research articles on small class size, reported that one of the results is less discipline problems with students. John Zahorik (1999), in his review of programs on class size reduction in three states, also shared the same view. He stated that one of the major results of reducing class size was the increase in instruction due to the lack of disciplining. He said that the research teams of Cahen, Filby, McCutchen, and Kyle (1983), Robinson and Wittebols (1986), and Johnston and Davis (1989) also reached this conclusion. In another article by Anke Halbach, Karen Ehrle, John Zahorik, and Alex Molnar (2001), in a further review of programs that are reducing class size, the results seem to indicate the benefits of a safe and orderly environment. With the reduction in class size, one of the benefits is that . . . "Teachers of smaller classes reported an overall reduction in discipline problems" (p. 32). They wrote that there are now two decades of studies which have documented greater achievement gains for students in small classes compared to larger classes.

Another proponent of smaller classrooms that create a safe and orderly climate is Patricia Handley (2002). In Handley's article she shared 28 years of teaching experience in both large and small classrooms. She indicated that students have opportunities to be heard in smaller classrooms. Discussions can be held without having to raise their hand and students learn to allow classmates to finish speaking and to answer accordingly. She said the exchange of thoughts, philosophies, and opinions become a foundation for classroom respect and regard.

Evers and Bacon (1994), in their study of the perceptions of Effective School components in Florida schools gave a clear definition, as described by San Diego County

schools and accepted by the Florida schools. In their description of this correlate, all parties are engaged in purposeful activities that are learning-related. Positive feedback, discipline policies, and encouragement are consistent. The definition also described the campus as attractive and well-kept by staff, students, and parents. Evers and Bacon emphasized the research by Bullard and Taylor (1993) and Lezotte (1990), which stated that a safe and orderly environment of an Effective School had an atmosphere where it is businesslike and purposeful, which would be free of physical harm, threat or oppressive.

David Murray (1995) said the literature suggests (Edmonds, 1979; Rutter, 1979; and others) that every school should have a written code of conduct that defines specific and acceptable behaviors. He explained that Stringfield (1992) wrote that these standardized operating procedures are characteristic of a highly reliable organization.

Ron Banks (1997) suggested that a school without a safe and orderly environment will have negative consequences for the general school climate.

Patricia George (2000), in an article that reviewed differing programs in relation to principals as leader, also comes to the conclusion that, “Creating a safe, orderly climate that promotes student achievement and meets the individual needs of its students is a goal of every educator” (p. 3).

In an interesting study by Dentler (1994), of 11 school districts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, this correlate directly impacted student learning. All the schools in his study suffered from rising rates of crime, violence, drugs, and family breakdown. One of the schools in Phoenix, in 1991, held the record for the most drive by shootings. What is interesting is the difference in the three high performing districts. These districts

placed a high value on social, health, and psychological services for the students. There was also a close collaboration between the schools and the local social and health agencies and police. The community and the subsequent diverse ethnic subcommunities were invested in the schools and all participants were unified in their political determination to do what was necessary to create an atmosphere of success. This study also showed that it was not necessarily the rich schools which were a success. The involvement of all stakeholders in the schools was the factor for success, not money. A determinate factor for success was strongly influenced by the quality of teaching, health, and protective services that were offered at the school.

Jerome Freiberg (1998) stated, "A healthy school climate contributes to effective teaching and learning" (p. 22). In an article by William Owings and Leslie Kaplan (2000), their approach to safe and orderly schools was different. "Principals and assistant principals have two primary jobs: keeping students safe and keeping them learning. Effective principals recognize the synergy in these two jobs, but it has never been more difficult to do either one" (p. 54). This article gives us many statistics showing the violence on school campuses. It also tells us that overall the statistics for fights, deaths, weapons, and student injury due to violence has decreased over the past several years. However, they also show us that suspension and expulsion rates are at an all-time high.

Owings and Kaplan wrote that Jenson (1998) expressed the view that threats of violence in the school environment may be the single greatest contributor to impaired academic learning.

In a related article, Mary Fenley (1993) stressed the need for a safe and orderly environment. In her article, she reviewed several successful programs that were being offered around the country. Within the framework of the programs was the need for the schools and communities to work effectively together:

In a survey by Vicente Paredes (1992) in which he analyzed data from three instruments on school climate, the findings indicated that school climate was a variable that was most highly related to student achievement. The data also suggested that in schools where there was a positive school climate, there was also a high rate of leaning and lower dropout rate.

Royal Van Horn (1999) in an article where the discussion was about the multiple-variables of inner-city schools, the school climate correlate was approached:

> The climate of a school is an important concept in its own right. The extent to which the school atmosphere promotes openness, colleagueship, professionalism, trust, loyalty, commitment, pride, academic excellence, and cooperation is critical in developing a healthy work environment for teachers and administrators (p. 294).

The author stressed the importance of school climate and as an indicator of the mental health of a school.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.2 from Administrators to Research Question #1 Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations, indicated an over all weakness to the response. The respondents answered strongly

within the “sometimes” to “seldom.” The importance of this Correlate is strongly stressed in the present research. The responses imply a lack of support for this Correlate by the administrators.

Joyce L. Epstein (1995), in an article on schools, family, and community partnerships, came to this conclusion, “The way schools care about children is reflected in the way schools care about the children’s families” (p. 701).

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995, in their review of Effective School Research and its correlates, clearly indicated the importance of this home and school partnership. The authors indicated that Coleman and others in their research have shown the benefits of schools working with parents and parental involvements in their children’s learning. The authors go on to share that Armor and others (1976) showed that parental presence in school and their participation in committees, events, and other activities all had a positive effect on achievement. At the same time, they also shared that Brookover and Lezotte (1979) found no support for a relationship between parental involvement and effectiveness.

Murray (1995), in his study of South Carolina Schools, made this blanket statement about parental and community involvement:

It has been known for a long time that parent involvement, particularly in support of the instructional program, strengthens success among their children.

In a study by D’Amico (2001), he reviewed data on the achievement gap of minorities in schools. The consensus of schools that were narrowing the gap was in the development of a school community. “These are racially and economically diverse

schools where staff and parents see high standards and achievement as the principal school goals" (p. 4). He further stated where schools and parents worked together, the students moved toward higher achievement and chose to take harder and more challenging classes. This was due, he believes, directly to parents and teachers working together.

In an article by Shelley Billig (2000), there is growing evidence for service-learning. She cited studies by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, who over a decade earlier, had suggested that there was a growing trend toward service-learning K-12 within the reform of education. She said that the authors indicated that there was growing understanding that young people seemed to be growing increasingly alienated from communities and from society. Because of this alienation, it was thought that this was the reason young people were less likely to volunteer and also the reason for decline in test scores in school. While service-learning was still unproven as an educational approach, she says the two authors concluded, "the case for community service as a legitimate educational practice receives provisional support from quantitative, quasi-experimental studies and even more consistent affirmation from the reports and testimony of participants and practitioners" (p. 661).

Arnold Fege (2000), in an article on parental roles within the schools, expressed the view that the modern parents' role in school is changing. He stated that with the results-oriented curriculum with accountability for learning means that parents become a strategic instructional resource for the school. He warned school leaders that they can no longer see parents as appendages to schooling. He said more and more parents see

themselves as "purchasers of public education with a right to demand from schools individualized services" (p. 39). With the speed of the internet, parents can now practice a form of direct democracy. They can talk to parents around the district, around the state, and around the country. He stressed that parents must be given more direct involvement. Schools will need to upgrade their ability to communicate with parents. He sees at present . . . "21st century families attempting to partner with 20th century school organizations" (p. 49). He strongly suggested that efforts to improve children's academic outcomes are more effective if they encompass families. A November 1999 national poll by Peter D. Hart Research Associates for Public Education Network revealed some interesting data about families: 89% of the respondents identified schools that provide a quality education as a very important community priority, 85% favored community involvement in schools over vouchers, 47% said that time was a barrier to participation at school, and 48% said they were not given the opportunity to be involved. The writer warned in the article that the data indicated there was a large untapped market of support that if the public schools do not approach, the private sectors will.

In a related article by Andy Hargreaves and Dean Fink (2000), who reviewed the results of two high schools in Ontario, Canada, their findings were interesting. Both schools were specialized for size, cost, leadership, staff recruitment, and retention. Where one school became successful and the other did not was in its ability to communicate with the community and parents. The writers indicated that . . . "In innovative settings, professional images of a good school are often at odds with the community's notion of a real school" (p. 31). They suggested that the educational battle

against poverty, disadvantage, and racial inequality involves making broad connections with families and dramatic changes to the structure and the curriculum of schools. The authors went on to stress that in the end, educators would do better to capture the public imagination on which governments depend by making their practice and improvement efforts highly visible and by helping create a broad social movement for large-scale, deep, and sustainable transformations in public education that will benefit all students.

Research Question #2

To what extent are the Effective School Correlates relevant to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by Charter School Teachers in Harris County, Texas?

Overall, the summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate A: A Clear and Focused School Mission, indicated an over all relevance. The respondents seem to agree with what present research concludes in regards to all 4 indicators. The agreement by the teachers is in direct conflict with the results of the administrators and poses several interesting questions. Research shows the importance of this Correlate and its indicators.

In an article on the Association for Effective Schools, Inc. web site (Lezotte, 1996), there is a statement that describes the assumptions placed on the correlates. "There are unique characteristics and processes common to schools where all children are learning, regardless of family background. Because these characteristics, found in schools where all students learn, are correlated with student success-they are called correlates" (p. 1). Dentler's (1994) study implied that a comprehensive shared vision in

his successful schools was directly related to the historical, cultural, and educational conditions.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, indicated an over all relevance. The respondents seem to agree with what present research concludes in regards to 5 indicators. Indictor 6: The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successful was responded to as "seldom" or "irrelevant." The response by the teachers is in agreement with the responses of the administrators and poses several interesting questions. Research shows the importance of this Correlate and its indicators.

The State of Texas accepted the Effective School Research model and its correlates as a way of determining whether the state's schools are effective. This included all juvenile justice alternative educational facilities (Texas Education Agency, Effective School Correlates, 2004).

Greg Druian (1986) questioned the application of the correlates. He remarked that, while there is a growing belief and a general consensus among educators, that the characteristics of Effective Schools can be identified and described. He commented that there is an emerging question among these same educators as to how widely the indicators of Effective Schools may be applied.

Application of the Correlates and the indicators for Correlate B: Instructional Leadership, seems to be in questions by the respondents.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, indicated an over all relevance. The respondents seem to agree with what present research concludes in regards to the 4 indicators. The respondents did not agreed with the administrators in regards to indicators 3 and 4. Both of these indicators are in relations to the importance of the parents being involved in receiving information about the students academic and behavior progress. While the teachers responses were "relevant" to "sometimes." The administrators response was weaker. Research indicates the importance of this Correlate and the responses by both groups indicate and imply a lack of consistency in regards to this Correlate. Application of the Correlates and the indicators for Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, seems to be in questions by the respondents.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate D: High Expectations for All, indicated an over all relevance to the 3 indicators. The data imply a "sometimes" to indicator 1 in which the teacher expects all students to master the benchmarks. This agrees with the administrators in regards to this indicator as well. Indicators 2 and 3 are both responded to by the teachers as predominantly relevant. The lack of support for indicator 1 implies a weakness in this Correlate. Research clearly implies the importance of this Correlate and its 3 indicators. Application of the Correlates and the indicators for Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, seems to be in questions by the respondents.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task, indicated an over all weakness to 3 of the 4 indicators. Indicators 1, 2 and 3 which correspond to the teaching-learning process, materials and activities and application of the student's culture and heritage are responded strongly with "seldom." The response by the administrators to these Correlates agreed with the teachers for indicator 1, 3 and 4.

Research by Jon Zahorik (1999), Bullard and Taylor (1993), Laraine Hong (2001) and others clearly show the importance of this Correlate and its indicators. Application of the Correlate and the indicators for Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task, seems to be in questions by the respondents.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning, indicated an over all response of "relevant." The administrators also responded with a strong "relevant." The data implies the over-all acceptance of this Correlate and its 3 indicators.

Research by John Holloway (2002), Patricia Handley (2002), David Murray (1995) suggests the importance of this Correlate. The acceptance and application of the Correlate and its 3 indicators are indicated in this data.

The summary of the percentages of the total respondents in table 4.3 from Teachers to Research Question #2 Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations, indicated an over all response of "seldom" or "irrelevant." The administrators responded

to this Correlate and its 3 indictors more positively. The implications of the data from the teachers and the administrators show a complete disagreement to this Correlate. Since this Correlate is communicative in nature, this disagreement is puzzling.

The research clearly shows the importance of the Correlate and its 3 indicators. Joyce L. Epstein (1995), Evers and Bacon (1994), Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995), D'Amico (2001) and Shelly Billig (2001), all indicate through their research the importance of a positive home and school relationship.

Application of the Correlate and the indicators for Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations, seems to be in questions by the respondents.

Many prominent researchers here in the United States and Great Britain have sought data on this subject through extensive research. At the present time, research results are as varied as the researchers themselves.

In 1988, the Effective School Research model and its Correlates were codified into federal education policy. The State of Texas accepted the Effective School Research model and its Correlates as a way of determining whether the state's schools were effective. This included all juvenile justice alternative educational facilities.

This study reviewed the literature, which revealed a potential lack of fit between the Effective School Correlates as the "Key Characteristics of Effective Schools" and their relevance to the context of alternative schools for students in the correctional systems.

Schools who institute the Effective School Research model imply they meet the needs of the poor urban students. Michael E. Dantly (1990) strongly disagreed with the

assumption and went on to state that the paradigm was rather simplistic. The intricacies and multidimensional aspect of school organizations and the social and economic realities of the students were not adequately considered. His belief that the organization itself has not been satisfactorily approached by the model is also a concern.

Daniel Levine (1990) cautioned that organizations by their very nature are non-rational and are continually forming and shaping entities. He further shared concerns about the Effective School Research model in regards to its application in reference to the discrepancies in pedagogical strategies between middle-class and urban poor classrooms. In his article, Levine remarks that the Effective Schools movement proclaimed a resolution to the dilemmas facing students who are at risk in urban poor schools. He further stated that schools according to proselytes of the Effective Schools liturgy, are bland and frictionless institutions which, when led by effective principals who embrace this paradigm, become institutions that automatically meet the specific needs of poor urban students. He went on to imply that the rather simplistic regimen Effective School proponents suggest revealed a systematic autism, which fails to take into consideration the social and economic realities of the movement's rather limited perspective of schools: the intricacies and multidimensional aspects of organizations, schools, and leadership frequently are ignored. The author suggests that organization is the area of Effective Schools that must be approached. In his writing he supported this idea with definitions about organizations from Schon (1986), who defined organizations as "repositories of cumulatively built-up knowledge: principles and maxims of practice, images of mission and identity, facts about the task environments, techniques of

operation, and stores of past experience which serve as exemplars for future actions" (p. 586). Continuing, Dantley said that March (1986) implied that organizations are neither unconditionally malleable nor unconditionally rigid; rather, they are a set of complicated collections of interests and beliefs. In his 1990 article, Daniel Levine cautioned that for this very reason organizations cannot be perceived as rations. He further suggested that organizations must be viewed as non-rational, continually forming and shaping entities. From this premise he then warned, "At the outset, caution is recommended in drawing conclusions from Effective School Research and in deriving implications for practices in the field. Among the reasons for urging potential users of this literature to guard against simplistic interpretations are the following:

1. Much of the research involves inherently problematic multivariate analysis that tends to base conclusions on schools that have been identified as effective, but that do differ greatly in achievement from other schools of comparable socioeconomic composition. . .
2. Case studies and other descriptive analyses of unusually effective schools are susceptible to some of the same problems (i.e., failure to take adequate account of socioeconomic status and dependence on assessment of lower order learning . . .)
3. Authors of different studies generally use different definitions and instruments to assess and collect information on school characteristics. Variations in terminology and instrumentation mean that characteristics

> identified as important in some studies will not be cited in others that did not even attempt to examine them . . . ” (pp. 577-578).

In his 1990 article, Dantley shared several concerns about the Effective School Research model and its overall application to public schools. He stressed that the work by Dr. Edmonds avoids the essential grappling with issues such as unfair distribution of goods and services, the need to alter the current social order, and the causes for the discrepancies in pedagogical strategies between middle-class and urban poor classrooms. He further stated that Sizemore (1985), in her writings, points to contentions with Edmonds' model by suggesting that his work on Effective Schools for the urban poor ignores the questions about race and class compositions. Dantley also contended that the Effective Schools Research model fails to consider certain features of American society that systematically obviate the inclusion of what the dominant culture designates as the educated, learned, or good members of marginalized ethic, gender, and socioeconomic groups into society's mainstream. He also cautions that questions of ethics and value that focus upon the social efficacy of current societal functions, beliefs, and predispositions are left unasked by the Effective School movement. The author suggests that the current movement lauds and essentially promotes as an assimilationist response from disenfranchised groups to the current educational institutions, and it has failed to recognize a lack of interconnection with these groups.

In his article on school diversification, Ron Brandt (2002), the Executive Editor Emeritus of *Education Leadership*, strongly objected to imposing a particular brand of education on every public school and its students.

Educators face the difficult task of altering existing school models that offer diplomas within the confines of alternative school programs (Groth, 1998). These educators attempt to create alternative programs by adapting the current policies and curriculum needed to satisfy the student's academic needs. The author further stated that the task to meet the alternative challenge is made more difficult by trying to stay within these existing educational systems.

Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) expressed the idea that educators have a basic understanding about what makes an Effective School. They also contended that the use of Effective School Correlates might be applied to at-risk youth programs. They suggested and cautioned, however, that within the use of these techniques there might be a danger. The writer's concerns were that the Effective Schools movement itself might be construed as a threat to at-risk youth if there are not sufficient accommodations for the special needs of these particular students.

Stringfield (1997) questioned the ability of the Effective Schools programs to address the unique needs of the educationally disadvantaged.

Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998) suggested that attempts to achieve greater school effectiveness must address both expressive and instrumental elements of school life. They further said that specific school attributes matter most and that the dynamics of the school process itself need to be alterable.

Lytle (1990) suggested that school improvement in its present form is considered a matter of modifying staffing, policy, and resource allocations. This author further suggested that none of the advocates of improvement entertains the possibility that, as

currently organized, the school might be inappropriate for educating disadvantaged students.

Sammons (1999) remarked that the effects of Effective School Correlates to at-risk programs are very damaging to schools and their outcomes. With the strong belief in the key characteristics of Effective Schools, inspectors and other professionals (in Great Britain) who are auditing the at-risk programs, according to this author, may judge schools against what they consider best practice. School inspectors and auditors often refer to the Effective School Research explicitly and the author warned that this view is unreliable application of the Correlates.

Tom Corcoran, Susan Fuhrman, and Catherine Belcher (2001), in a review of three districts, said attempts at instructional improvement came to this conclusion. They suggested that the limitations of the districts to improve were due in part to their lack of processes as to what to change. The districts seldom, "considered how teachers viewed the cost and benefits of new programs, and they rarely developed comprehensive marketing campaigns to persuade staff members to adopt new practices" (p. 83). The authors stressed that in most cases the districts simply mandated reform.

Richard Elmore and Susan Fuhrman (2001), in a review of a study done by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, indicated that different schools respond differently to the high stakes of reform. The results of the survey as reviewed by the authors implied that low-capacity, low-performing schools often do not respond to student-and school-level consequences by improving their instruction. Instead, the

authors said the schools simply continue to do the same things they were doing, only doing them harder.

Linda M. McNeil's (2000) research indicated a concern with the Effective School movement as it is applied to all students. She stated that there is a growing inequality between the quality of education provided for advantaged students and students with less advantage.

Donald Thomas and William Bainbridge (2001) suggested that there are five "fallacies" being perpetuated about the Effective School movement and their Correlates through lectures and articles. These fallacies include: 1) all children can learn, 2) the principal is the instructional leader, 3) setting standards by exceptions, 4) uniform academic standards for all children, and 5) teachers must work smarter and not harder. These authors also shared the view that uniform application of the Effective School Correlates has created a major concern among some educational researchers.

Although Barbara O. Taylor (2002) defended the Effective School Correlates and their process, she admitted that research has shown the performance of school districts in large urban settings using the Effective School Correlates had not changed.

The accumulated knowledge of alternative programs for young people seems to substantiate the research on Effective Schools. The differences lie principally with goals and purposes of this specific type of education (Edmonds, 1979).

Groth (1998) and Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998) strongly suggested that applying the Effective School Research to alternative education formulas, though difficult, is possible through alteration. However, Groth (1998) was also concerned

about the danger of applying the Effective School best practices when these highly specialized schools have little control over outcomes.

Coe and Fitz-Gibbon (1998) had grave concerns over Effective School Research in reference to definition and the restricted and inappropriate range of the outcomes. The authors contended that the research is limited due to the absence of longitudinal data and is characterized by unsupported assumptions and a lack of good modeling.

In a paper by Eubanks and Parish (1992), which was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA, the authors contended that it is difficult to discover any widespread, fundamental, or substantive change in schooling outcomes as a result of Effective Schools. They gave as examples the Kansas City Effective School ongoing project where, after five years and 18 schools, modest-to-good improvement has been the student outcome. They further contended that a major limitation to the model is looking at the outcome. In Kansas City, there was modest-to-good improvement across the board. While the lowest quartile improved the largest amount all quartiles improve, the authors show that the improvement is along race and class lines. They further expressed the belief that in several other school districts across the country where the Effective Schools model has been implemented (New York, Milwaukee, and Chicago), the results are similar. They conjectured that the strongest correlation for achievement on test scores is social class. The Coleman Studies (1966) established this social class, racial, and gender correlation. They went on to say that, even today, test publishing companies now publish data that allow school districts to compare their outcomes with school districts of similar school

populations. This data, they contended, clearly established class, race, and gender correlations with test results.

Evers and Bacon (1994), reminded us in their study that their findings were limited. Their study showed that while there is a correlational understanding, there is still no causal aspect. While the teachers and staff could identify the components of the Effective Schools in the study, they could not describe how schools are able to become effective. The study also showed that portions of the Correlates were vague even with the content descriptors within the questionnaire. Terms such as Safe and Orderly Environment were open to different interpretations by different people. The authors stressed that further study is needed.

George Bramley (1995), in his survey work, also came to the conclusion that school effectiveness has many definitions, which he feels, is in part due to various social groups and their understandings of what the Correlates do or do not mean.

Margaret Goertz (2001), in an article about the limitations of communication and redefining government's roles, indicated the confusion over the definition of success. In a Congressionally mandated review, the author said that the panel concluded that due to the variability and flexibility of the differing states and districts to understand success. What might be deemed success in one school, according to the Congressional review, may be considered low-performing in another. The review further contended that the more states that give districts discretion, the greater the variations in local policy and practice.

The very act of narrowing the reform of the modern school in relation to assessment is also a limitation. According to Joan L. Herman (1992), who completed a review of research in relation to assessments and its impact on low-performing students, the research indicated that this narrowing will impact schools serving at-risk and disadvantaged students.

D'Amico (2001), in his review of the educational success of minorities, indicated that since 1988 there has been a reversal of the trends of success. While the Effective School Research continually communicates the fundamental belief of Edmonds, Lezotte, and others, this author does not agree:

> Among the many socio-cultural correlates and hypothesized causes of the achievement gap, some researchers have zeroed in on those that have been in the literature for decades. Chief among these is poverty, which researchers like Arroyo and colleagues (1999) and Bracey (1999) have noted is still a very strong predictor of low achievement in school. Weston (2000) concurs with this assessment and goes on to suggest that minority status in combination with poverty strengthens the correlation (p. 2).

In another area that clearly moves from the Effective School Correlates, the author stated that other studies have shown a school correlation to a lack of success. "Caldas and Bankston (1997, 1998) saw this situation and its negative effect on achievement as being even more prevalent in schools where there are high concentrations of students who are both minority and poor" (p. 3). Another interesting area of study that the author brings out is in cultural identification. He refers to many studies by

researchers (Settlemyer, 2000; Singham, 1998; Viadero, 2000b; Cook & Jens, 1998), which showed evidence that minority students may maintain low levels of school achievement purposely to avoid acting white" (p. 3). D'Amico ended his paper with the statement espoused by many researchers. He stressed that after looking at years of data and correlating the achievement gap, it is apparent (by this writer) that we should . . . "stop investing in, encouraging, and mandating one-size-fits-all programs without seeing whether they will have an impact on specific student needs" (p. 7). He indicated that research data showed that success in school and even later in life may very well have a direct correlation to their race and ethnicity.

In a strong article by Gerald W. Bracey (1999), a research psychologist, he responded to research and articles that seem to imply that poverty is no excuse for a lack of success. In his article he cites researchers Kevin Payne and Bruce Biddle, who have done extensive research in the field of wealth and educational success in public schools. The author quoted the two researches as saying:

> If American math achievement scores had been generated only by well-funded schools in districts with low levels of poverty, the United States would have earned an aggregate achievement score slightly better than the second-ranked nation in the study, the Netherlands. In contrast, had our country been represented only by miserably funded schools in high-poverty districts, our aggregate achievement scores would have been below those of other industrialized nations, studied and nearly on a par with those of Nigeria and Swaziland (p. 330).

Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1999), in their review of School Effectiveness Research, had this to say in their conclusion:

> The majority of effectiveness studies have focused exclusively on students' cognitive outcomes in areas such as reading, mathematics, or public examination results. Only a relatively few (mainly British) studies have paid attention to social/affective outcomes (e.g., Reynolds, 1976; Rutter, 1979; Mortimore et al., 1988a; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993). Because of this focus, the results of our review, inevitably, tell us more about the correlates of academic effectiveness. As Reynolds (1994) had observed, we have less evidence about school and classroom processes that are important in determining school success in promoting social or affective outcomes such as behavior, attendance, attitudes, and self-esteem (p. 23).

These researchers went on to stress the need for further study and research in the areas of student motivation and commitment to school. While they feel identifying the Correlates of Effective Schools is important, the affective areas of self-esteem, attendance, and attitudes are just as important.

In an older article by Garrett Mandeville (1986), his conclusion about the limitations of Effective Schools was stressed when he said, "it is an understatement to say that there are many unresolved questions surrounding the identification of Effective Schools. Various approaches based on absolute gains, trends, and regression methods tend to produce inconsistent results and different regression-based methodologies do not even agree" (p. 6).

In a study by Evers and Bacon (1994) and the subsequent data desegregation of the questionnaire in reference to the Effective School Correlates, they determined that there was a clear difference in perceptions as to the understanding of the Correlates:

> A limitation to this study is that findings are correlative and not causal. Being able to accurately describe the components of effective schools does not mean that one is able to describe how schools are able to become effective. Terms such as Safe and Orderly Environment are vague even with the content descriptors that are being used in this study. The Correlates of an Effective School are open to different interpretations by different people (p. 8).

Thomas and Bainbridge (2001) wrote an article in which they described the 'fallacies' of Effective Schools Research. The authors contended that it is a fallacy that all children can learn—at the same level and in the same amount of time. They further stated that all children can learn, at some level, and most children, as Ronald Edmonds wrote, can learn the basic curriculum if sufficient resources are provided. "The fallacy, however, is the belief that all children can learn the same curriculum, in the same amount of time, and at the same level" (p. 661). They also shared the idea about brain development and the lack of proper nutrition in young children in homes of poverty:

> Research in cognitive brain development shows that formation of synaptic contacts in the human cerebral cortex occurs between birth and age 10 (Peter Huttenlocher and Arun Dabholkar, 1997), and most of the brain gets built within a few years after birth. Environment matters greatly in brain development. . . . Brains that do not get enough protein and stimulation in their environments lose

> connections, and some potential neural pathways are shut down (John T. Bruer, 1999). These facts help to explain what educators have long observed: children from impoverished environments, in which they do not receive good nutrition and stimulating experiences, generally achieve at lower levels than children from more enriching environments (p. 661).

They continued their review of Effective School Research and ended with a remarkable quote by Edmund Burke, "The equal treatment of unequals is the greatest injustice of all."

Taylor (2002), in an article defending the Effective School Research, and thus the Correlates did, however, concede that there has been a movement away from the original direction of the research. "Unfortunately, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, educators who were formerly advocates of the comprehensive Effective Schools Process broke off certain elements of that process and overemphasized them, to the detriment of the whole process" (p. 377). She then goes on to mention William Spady, and his outcomes-based education (OBE) program and Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools Projects, which have been accepted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, and others. She stated there are some who overemphasized leadership. She even went on to say at one point that, "due to the work carried out by such consultants is the reason Thomas and Bainbridge felt that the Effective Schools movement has been contaminated. Perhaps they are correct in a narrow sense" (p. 376).

According to Lezotte and Bancroft (1985), the three major attributes of Effective School Research and its role in reform are: Quality and Equity, Research-Based, and Data Driven. They then go forward and list attributes that they feel are important.

The first attribute of Effective School Research is the quality and equity of educational opportunity. The authors stressed that a school must be able to demonstrate that both quality and equity are concurrently present. The authors stated that the effectiveness of this question can be summed up by asking, "What does the nation want from its public schools?" The consistent response by the public of this country, according to the authors, is that they expect children to experience a quality education and they believe that all school children should have equal educational opportunity. The authors commented that if this is the perceived educational mission of our public schools, then it would follow that any school wishing to claim that it is effective will be able to substantiate that claim. They further stated that any school embarking on school improvement will incorporate quality and equity into its purpose and goals.

The second attribute of Effective School Research, according to the authors, is school improvement based on a research–founded model. This research model is based on fifteen years of study, three interdependent bodies of related research, effective staff development, effective organization development in education, and effective planned change programs. Both authors stressed that as we move further into the use of the model, more knowledge through application will be gained.

The third attribute discussed by Lezotte and Bancroft (1985) is that the model is data driven. The weight of measurable or observable evidence is very important. Data

driven evidence is useful for planning, according to the authors. They asserted that data also offers flexibility for attending to what is important and necessary. As new information arrives, the teachers and students can modify the goals. This ability to use data allows for flexibility and versatility.

In the book, *School Effectiveness: Coming of Age in the Twenty-First Century*, by Sammons (1999), the author took a close look at the impact, understanding, and use of Effective School Research. She stated that the major focus of school effectiveness research concerns the idea that "school matters, that schools do have major effects upon children's development and that, to put it simple, schools do make a difference" (Reynolds & Creemers, 1990, p. 1).

In a paper presented at the Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, by William Webster and Robert Mendro (1994), the authors wrote that the School Effectiveness Methodology defines that effectiveness is based on exceptional measured performance above that which would be expected across the entire school district.

Eubanks and Parish (1992) in their paper, "Effective Schools Tinkering and School Cultures: Maintaining Schools that Sort by Race, Class, and Gender," implied that the role of Effective School Research has now become part of the language of numerous schools and colleges of education. The authors go on to suggest that the research and the correlates are now an integral part of American schooling.

Dantley (1990) said that the Effective School Movement proclaims a resolution to the dilemmas facing students who are at risk in urban poor schools. He further stated

that proselytes of the Effective Schools liturgy describe these schools as bland and frictionless institutions which, when led by effective principals who embrace this paradigm, become institutions that automatically meet the specific needs of poor urban students.

George Bramley (1995) suggested that the purpose of the school indicators falls into two distinct components. The first component is a summation of a school as being either good or bad, or somewhere on the continuum inbetween. The second and more significant component is to measure the impact of implementing new school policies and, where appropriate data were maintained, to evaluate the consequence of current policy against some appropriate historical benchmark.

Levine (1990) expressed his view that the Effective School Movement and subsequent Correlates are being used by numerous schools and districts to design their own Effective School Programs for improving student performance.

James Lytle (1990) clearly described the role of Effective School Research in relation to the federal government. At the reauthorization of Chapter I in 1988 (PL100-297-April 28, 1988), the language of the law specifically used terms that described the Effective School Programs as key components in accountability provisions. The components, according to Lytle, would include an extensive parent involvement provision, concentration grants, and an innovative programs provision. The Effective School Programs provision, as defined by Congress, was to mean "promoting school-level planning, instructional improvement, and staff development; increasing the academic achievement levels of all children and, particularly, educationally deprived

children; and achieving as ongoing conditions in the school the . . . factors identified through effective schools research as distinguishing effective from ineffective schools" (p. 210). Lytle further stated that the House Committee on Education and Labor (1988) reviewed Effective School Research and published the 71-page review entitled, "Increasing Educational Success: The Effective Schools Model." To further strengthen the role of Effective School Research in May of 1988, the Department of Education issued a Request for Proposals for a new center to "conduct and relate activities for the study of effective schooling of disadvantaged students."

A longitudinal study of effective versus ineffective schools by Charles Teddlie and Sam Stringfield (1993) concluded that there is a positive effect on the students beyond school. Sam Stringfield and Rebecca Herman (1997) in their work concluded that schools have a positive effect on disadvantaged students' academic achievements.

In an article by Barbara Taylor (2002), which was a defense of the Effective Schools Research movement, she briefly revisited its history and role.

In the early 1980s, the Effective School Movement produced empirical research that caught the heart of the message of 'all children can learn.' The original Correlates became expanded descriptions of 'what works' in school reform. Secretary of Education William Bennett espoused the Effective School Movement, and over the decade the language of the Correlates became the language of school improvement and school reform. (See "The Correlates of Effective Schools," p. 377). 'High expectations' or teaching all children to agree upon (state and local) standards so that they will be successful at the next grade level, site-based management for reaching a consensus with

faculties on ‘what works,’ school and classroom change strategies that address school and district mission statements, and data-guided decision making—all became part and parcel of good school reform programs” (p. 376).

In a paper by Bruce Barker and Kevin Robinson (2001), in relation to Effective Schools and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, the authors indicated that the role of Effective School Research and its Correlates “are the means to achieving high and sustained levels of student learning. This is true regardless of gender, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. The Correlates are research-based characteristics of a school’s climate directly associated with improved or better student learning” (p. 4).

The codification of the Effective School Research model and its Correlates into the Hawkins-Stafford Law of 1988 placed states in position for accepting the model. The State of Texas accepted the Effective School Research model and its Correlates as a way of determining whether the state's schools are effective. This included all juvenile justice alternative educational facilities.

The Texas Youth Commission operates year-round educational programs for incarcerated youth ages 10 through 21. The primary goal of the Texas Youth Commission’s educational program is to provide each youth the opportunity to learn the maximum educational skills possible during the time the youth is a student. The Commission's latest statistics report that the current student population is approximately 4,825 juveniles. They are arranged in the following categories: Capital and Serious Violent Offenders, Sex Offenders, Chemically Dependent Youth, and Emotionally Disturbed Youth (Texas Youth Commission, Research and Data, 2004). The

Commission further describes these incarcerated youth with the following criteria: (1) 90% are young men, (2) 10% are young women, (3) 44% are Hispanic, (4) 31% are African-American, (5) 25% are Anglo, (6) 33% admitted at intake that they are gang members, (7) median age at commitment is 16, (8) median reading and math achievement level is 5th or 6th grade, (9) 77% have IQs below the mean score of 100, (10) 54% have a high need for drug treatment, (11) 48% are severely emotionally disturbed, (12) 69% have parents who never married or who divorced or separated, (13) 43% have a history of being abused or neglected, (14) 59% come from low-income homes, (15) 79% come from chaotic environments, (16) 55% have families with histories of criminal behavior, (17) 11% have family members with mental impairments, and (18) 56% were in juvenile court on two or more felon-level offenses before being committed to the Texas Youth Commission (Texas Youth Commission, Research and Data, 2004).

The findings that emerged from this research regarding the relevance of the Effective School Research model and its Correlates seem to imply several problems exist. The paramount implications are apparent confusion of those surveyed. The responsibility, application and communication of the correlates were clearly confusing to those surveyed. The data tables showed a wide variance in answers between the schools. While there may be sufficient reasons to warrant the variances the possibility of a lack of training in the application of the Correlates may be suspected.

Recommendations

Findings of this study indicated that problems exist with the application of the Correlates as they relate to the selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas. The

population size limited the study and caution should be taken not to over-generalize the data.

Based on findings and conclusions of this study, data and research analysis, and review of the literature, the following recommendations can be made:

1. Ongoing assessment or evaluation of the correlates should be undertaken. Additional research should be performed to determine whether the application of the Correlates within this specific field of education is successful.

2. While this study identified the areas of involvement in regards to the Effective School Correlates between the two groups, it indicated that there were differences in the various groups in relation to the degree of application of the Correlates (Research Questions #1 and #2).

3. The Texas Education Agency should review its policy in regards to the application of the Effective School Research model and its Correlates within the Texas Youth Commission. The modification and/or restatement of certain Correlates as they apply to the Texas Youth Commission should be revisited (Research Question #3).

Recommendations for further study.

Information about the relevance or irrelevance of the Effective School Research model Correlates was gained from this study. However, other areas related to this study were raised. The following are suggested for further study:

1. The study provided some preliminary findings with regard to the link between Teachers and Administrators in their attempt to apply the Effective School Research model Correlates and its Indicators. Further study should be implemented to fully

understand the application of the Correlates of the two groups in relation to juvenile education (Research Questions #1 and #2).

2. The study provided some preliminary findings with regard to interaction between Teachers and Administrators. Further research that includes investigation of ways to conduct needs assessment of the professional staff in mandated areas so that proper training can be implemented is recommended.

3. The study clearly shows a discrepancy in response between the Teachers and Administrators in relation to Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission.

4. The study clearly shows a discrepancy in response between the Teachers and Administrators in relation to Correlate B: Instructional Leadership.

5. The study clearly shows a weakness in response between the Teachers and Administrators in relation to Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress.

6. The study clearly shows a discrepancy in response between the Teachers and Administrators in relations to Correlate D: High Expectations for All.

7. The study clearly shows a discrepancy in response between the Teachers and Administrators in relations to Correlate E: The opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task.

8. The study clearly shows a discrepancy in response between the Teaches and Administrators in relations to Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations.

9. The study clearly shows a lack of research of Juvenile education facilities and their over-all findings.

REFERENCES

Ash, R., & Persall, M. (2004). *The principal as chief learning officer: The new work of formative leadership*. Birmingham, AL: Samford University.

Banks, R. (1997). Bullying in schools. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. http://www.ericdigests.org/1997-4/bullying.htm Retrieved July 28, 2004 from the EDRS database.

Barker, B., & Robinson, K. (2001, October). *Effective rural schools and national board professional teaching standards.* Paper presented at the Annual National Rural Education Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Biddle, B., & Berliner, D. (2002). Small class size and its effects. *Educational Leadership, 59*(5), 12-23.

Billig, S. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service-learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(10), 660-668.

Bracey, G. (1999). Poverty and achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 61*(4), 330-31.

Bracey, G. (2002). Raising achievement of at-risk students—or not. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(6), 431-32.

Bramley, G. (1995). *School performance indicators and school effectiveness: The conceptions and the critiques*. West Midlands, England: Wolverhampton University.

Brandt, R. (2002). The case for diversified schooling. *Educational Leadership, 59*(7), 12- 19.

Brown Schools. (2004). Harris county juvenile justice charter schools. Retrieved July 27, 2004 from: http://www.brownschools.com/hariscounty.html.

Carpenter, W. (2000). Ten years of silver bullets: Dissenting thoughts on education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(5), 383-89.

Cawelti, G. (2000). Portrait of a benchmark school. *Educational Leadership, 57*(5), 42-44.

Chaskin, R., & Rauner, D. (1995). Youth and caring: An introduction. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 667-674.

Chrispeels, J. (2002). The California Center for Effective Schools: The Oxnard School District partnership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(5), 382-387.

Coe, R., & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1998). School effectiveness research: Criticism and recommendations. *Oxford Review of Education, 24*(4), 421-438.

Cohen, D., & Ball, D. (2001). Making change: Instruction and its improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 73-77.

Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (2002). What urban students say about good teaching. *Educational Leadership, 50*(1), 18-72.

Corcoran, T., Fuhrman, S., & Belcher, C. (2001). The district role in instructional improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 78-84.

D'Amico, J. (2001). A closer look at the minority achievement gap. *ERS Spectrum, 19* (2), 4-10.

Dantley, M. (1990). The ineffectiveness of effective schools leadership: An analysis of the effective schools movement from a critical perspective. *The Journal of Negro Education, 59*(4), 585-598.

Dentler, R. (1994, April). *An overview of a field study of urban school districts in the far west.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Druian, G. (1986). Effective schooling and at-risk youth: What the research shows. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Goal Based Education Program.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning centered principal. *Educational Leadership, 50*(3), 12-15.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37* (1), 15-27.

Elmore, R., & Fuhrman, S. (2001). Holding schools accountable: Is it working? *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 67-72.

Epstein, J. (1995). School/family/community partnerships caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 701-712.

Eubanks, E., & Parish, R. (1992, April). *Effective schools, tinkering and school cultures: Maintaining schools that sort by race, class, and gender.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Evers, J., & Bacon, T. (1994, November). *Staff perceptions of effective school components as a means to school improvement and accountability*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Florida Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Fege, A. (2000). From fund raising to hell raising: New roles for parents. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7), 39-43.

Fenley, M. (1993). The prevention of youth violence: A framework for community action. Atlanta, GA: Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

Freiberg, J. (1998). Measuring school climate: Let me count the ways. *Educational Leadership, 56*, 22-26.

Friedman, I. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research, 88*(5), 281-288.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-20.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman Publisher.

Goertz, M. (2001). Redefining government roles in an era of standards-based reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 62-66.

Goodlad, J. (2004). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. (2004). *Education for everyone*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Gratz, D. (2000). High standards for whom? *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 681-687.

Groth, C. (1998). Dumping ground or effective alternative: Dropout prevention programs in urban schools. *Urban Education, 33*(2), 218-242.

Halbach, A., Ehrle, K., Zahorik, J., & Molnar, A. (2001). Class size reduction: From promise to practice. *Educational Leadership, 58*(6), 32-35.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2000). The three dimensions of reform. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7) 30-33.

Handley, P. (2002). Every classroom teacher's dream. *Educational Leadership, 59*(5), 33-35.

Herman, J. (1992). What research tells us about good assessment. *Educational Leadership, 49*(8), 74-78.

Holloway, J. (2002). Do smaller classes change instruction? *Educational Leadership, 59*(5), 91-92.

Hong, L. (2001). Too many intrusions on instructional time. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(9), 712-714.

Hyman, I., & Snook, P. (2000). Dangerous schools and what you can do about them. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(7), 489-498.

Janey, C. (2002). Must high school last four years? *Educational Leadership, 59*(7), 64-66.

Johnson, K. (2002). The downside to small class policies. *Educational Leadership, \ 59*(5), 27-29.

Jones, M., & Ross, E. (1994, January). *School improvement: A case study. An effective schools framework for partnerships in systemic reform.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Melbourne, Australia.

Keedy, J. (1992, March*). Translating a school improvement agenda into practice: A social interaction perspective to the principal ship*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Lashway, L. (2000). Who's in charge? The accountability challenge. *Principal Leadership, 3*, 8-13.

Levine, D.(1990). Update on effective schools: Findings and implications from research and practice. *The Journal of Negro Education, 59*(4), 577-584.

Levine, E. (2002). One kid at a time. *Educational Leadership, 59*(7), 29-32.

Lezotte, L., & Bancroft, B. (1985). School improvement based on effective schools research: A promising approach for economically disadvantaged and minority students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 54*(3), 301-312.

Lezotte, L. (1996). What is effective schools research? Retrieved July 27, 2004 from: http://www.mes.org/esr.html.

Lytle, J.H., (1990). Reforming urban education: A review of recent reports and legislation. *The Urban Review, 22*(3), 199-220.

Mandeville, G. (1986, April). *The evaluation of a "count down" procedure for identifying effective schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Manno, B., & Vanourek, G., & Finn, C. (1999). Charter schools: Serving disadvantaged youth. *Education and Urban Society, 31*(4), 429-445.

March, J., & Peters, K. (2002). Curriculum development and instructional design in the effective schools process. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(5), 379-381.

McNeil, L.M. (2000). Creating new inequalities: Contradictions of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(10), 7-30.

Murray, D. (1995). *Analysis of parent perceptions on effective school correlates: A springboard for planning.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Odden, A. (2000). The cost of sustaining educational change through comprehensive school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(6), 433-438.

Owings, W., & Kaplan, L. (2000). Secure schools: An instructional approach. *Principal Leadership (Middle School Ed.*), *54*(1), 54-59.

Paredes, V. (1992*). School climate in AISD*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Research and Evaluation.

Sammons, P. (1999). *School effectiveness coming of age in the twenty-first century*. The Netherlands:Swets and Zeitlinger Publishers.

Sammons, P., Hillman P. & Mortimore, P. (1995) *Key characteristics of effective schools.* London, England: Office for Standards in Education.

Scherer, M. (2002). Do students care about learning? *Educational Leadership, 60*(1), 12-17.

Schmitt, D. (1990, September). *The effect a principal has on the effective school program.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators, New Orleans, LA.

Sperling, D. (1993). What's worth an "A'? Setting standards together. *Educational Leadership, 50*(5), 73-75.

Stiller, J., & Ryan, R. (1992, April). *Teachers, parents, and student motivation: The effects of involvement and autonomy support.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Stringfield, S. (1997). Research on effective instruction for at-risk students: Implications for the St. Louis public schools. *Journal of Negro Education*, *66*(3), 259-288.

Stringfield, S., & Herman, R. (1997). The promising programs for educating all children: Evidence of impact. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.

Stringfield, S., & Teddlie,C. (1993*). Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10 year study of school effects.* New York: Teachers College

Tatum, B. (2000). Examining racial and cultural thinking. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(8), 54-57.

Taylor, B. (2002). The effective schools process: Alive and well. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(4), 375-378.

Teddlie,C. (1993*). Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10 year study of school effects.* New York: Teachers College

Texas Education Agency (2004). Chapter 37. Discipline: Law and order. Subchapter A. Alternative settings for behavior management. Retrieved August 3, 2004, from: http://www.tea.state.tx.us.

Texas Education Agency (2004). Effective School Correlates. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from: www.tea.state.tx.us/tsss/esc.pdf.

Texas Education Agency (1999). A report on safe schools programs. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from: http://www.tea.state.tx.us.

Texas Youth Commission. (2004). Programs and facilities: Education programs. Retrieved July 30, 2004, from: http://www.tyc.state.tx.us/.

Texas Youth Commission. (2004). Programs and facilities: Mother-Baby programs. Retrieved July 30, 2004, from: http://www.tyc.state.tx.us/.

Texas Youth Commission. (2004). Resources and data: Who are TYC offenders?. Retrieved July 30, 2004, from: http://www.tyc.state.tx.us/.

Texas Youth Commission. (2004). Statistics and reports: TYC population trends. Retrieved July 30, 2004, from: http://www.tyc.state.tx.us/.

Thomas, D., & Bainbridge, W. (2001). All children can learn. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(9), 660-662.

Uline, C., Miller, D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *34*(4), 462-483.

Van Horn, R. (1999). Inner-City schools: A multiple-variable discussion. *Phi Delta Kappan, 61*(4), 291-297.

Webster, W., & Mendro, R. (1994, July). *Identifying and rewarding effective schools: The Dallas school accountability program.* Paper presented at the Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, Gatlinburg, TN. Retrieved August 11, 2004 from the EDRS database.

Zahorik, J. (1999). Reducing class size leads to individualized instruction. *Educational Leadership, 57*(1), 50-53.

Zukas, T. (2000). An open letter from a parent: So you want to implement reform. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7), 54-55.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO THE BROWN SCHOOL PERTAINING TO THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL SURVEY

Vance Cortez-Rucker

P. O. Box 506
Dayton, Texas 77535
936-258-2712
936-258-1713 Fax
409-781-3117 Cell
Rucker@imsday.com

Mr. David Wood
Executive Director of Brown Schools
2525 Mursworth St., Suite 100
Houston, TX 77054

Dear Sir:

I am once again approaching you about the possibility of a survey. I visited with you approximately eight month ago and received a positive response from you. At that time I told you I had several protocol processes to overcome in my journey to do this survey. I have 'jumped' all of the hurdles at Texas A&M and am anxious to renew our contact and challenge.

The survey I am proposing for my doctoral dissertation is asking the question: Applicability of the Effective School Correlates on Alternative Educational Settings as Identified by Teachers and Administrators in Selected Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas.

I have three research questions in reference to the Effective Schools as they are applied to alternative schools.

1) To what extent are the Effective School Correlates applicable as identified by the Charter School Administrators? (Principals, Directors, Counselors)
2) To what extent are the Effective School Correlates applicable as identified by the Charter School Teachers?

And finally the one I feel that is important to Charter and all specialized educational facilities in Texas.....

3) How would Charter School teachers' and Administrators' in Harris County, Texas **change the Effective School Correlates to make them applicable to Charter Schools in Harris County, Texas?**

Sir, this is where I feel the real question will lie! New research is beginning to show that the Effective School Correlates (these correlates and their indicators are used to audit and weigh the effectiveness of all schools in the State of Texas) may not be applicable to highly specialized schools due to their very nature. The uniqueness of these schools may require alteration to these correlates to better serve the schools and students. THAT is my major question! If they do need changing. then lets ask the people who use them, what needs to be changed. Again...the survey may show that all is ok as it now stands, but my research is showing that there are professionals out in the trenches wanting to share their expertise and suggestions in reference to applicability of the correlates and their indicators. This survey will allow just that.

This survey and its results will be shared with not only you and your staff and company, but its unique information and results will be published in several educational, correctional and alternative school journals. I feel this will create a positive light on the work you and your staff

are doing and create a body of information that is useful as well as up-to-date! I am a firm believer in the specialized educational programs here in the State of Texas and feel that more support must be created for them. This will be a vehicle that can help and not hurt your schools.

If you are still willing to allow me to do this project I will need at least three campuses. I am hoping for: South Fannin School, ACES School and Harris County School for Excellence, but will leave it up to your discretion. I will survey only the teachers and administrative staff. The survey will be mailed home to them or handed out (completely at your discretion) and will take about thirty minutes to complete. There will be two additional surveys' to follow up. The first survey asks the basic question about the correlates and what they feel is applicable and not. Once that information is in, I will then mail out another survey showing the correlates that the respondents felt needed to be changed and ask them to rewrite or suggest new words etc. When that survey is returned I will then mail out the final survey showing the changed results and ask for a final opinion. This gives the professionals in Harris County, Texas and the Brown School an opportunity to alter the correlates and indicators to better serve there school setting and the needs of their students.

For privacy the survey will be packaged so it may be mailed to me (my expense not there's). I will follow any and all request you might have. We can modify as we go or as you see concerns arise. I am very easy to work with and as a school administrator of twenty years know that things change on a daily basis.

I look forward to hearing from you and am excited about this survey and its possible results. I have many people waiting on the results as this type of survey has NOT been done and the information will be very unique.

Again, I hope all is going well at the Brown Schools I await you reply.

Sincerely,

Vance Cortez-Rucker

"The greatest pleasure in life is doing what people say you cannot do." Walter Bagehot

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF EXPLANATION TO THE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS AT THE BROWN SCHOOL

Vance Cortez-Rucker
Principal
Kotzebue High School

P. O. Box 12
Kotzebue, Alaska 99752
Home -- 907-442-4144
Office – 907-442-3247 Ext. 651
vcrucker@nwarctic.org

November 4, 2002

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a Texan that is far far from home. I recently accepted a position working with the Inupiaq Indians of Alaska. My present position will be middle high school principal. Kotzebue is located twenty-six miles above the Arctic Circle in western Alaska. I will work with the population here for two years.

I am also completing my survey work for my dissertation at Texas A & M University where I hope to complete my PhD by early next summer. Inside this packet is a letter from Mr. David Wood explaining what this survey is all about.

I would appreciate your response to this survey and return it to me in this pre-addressed envelope. If you have any questions I can be reached at any of the above numbers. **Mail only the survey.**

On the day of this letter the temperature here was 18 degrees with slight snow flurries. You have my e-mail address; if you wish pictures of the truly far north I can put you on the e-mail list.

I appreciate your help in this. At this distance I am going to need as much support as I can get.

Sincerely,

Vance Cortez-Rucker

INFORMATION SHEET

You understand the following about this study:

It is a part of a doctoral dissertation. The purpose of the research study is to assess the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative educational settings for students in a correctional system as identified by the teachers and administrators in selected charter schools in Harris County, Texas.

Administrators and teachers will be identified by the Director of the three selected Charter Schools.

Identified administrators and teachers will be mailed a questionnaire, and a letter that describes the intent of the study. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Administrators and teachers will be asked to return the questionnaire to the researcher in an enclosed, stamped envelope. The data obtained from the questionnaire will be used to determine the relevance of the Effective School Correlates to alternative education in a correctional system.

All involvement in the study will be voluntary. There will be no physical, emotional, or social risk to the participants. Participants may leave any question, in the questionnaire, unanswered if they so desire. Participant's names and any data acquired from the questionnaire will be confidential, and the researcher will insure that all information will be kept in a safe and secure place. The results of the questionnaire will only be seen by the researcher to insure further security and confidentiality.

Participating Charter School administrators and the Director of Schools will receive the information that has been acquired through this study.

There will be no compensation for participation in this study.

You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subject' rights. You can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services. Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

You have read and understand the explanation provided to me. You have had all your questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

By returning this questionnaire, I voluntarily agree to participatge in this research.

Principal Investigator: _____ Date; 5-20-02

Vance Cortez-Rucker
P.O. Box 506
Dayton, Texas 77535
(936)258-2712
Rucker@imsday.com

Graduate Advisor: Dr. David Erlandson
Educational Administration & Human Resources Development
511 Harrington Tower
College Station, Texas 77843-4226
(979) 845-2792

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO THE BROWN SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE BROWN SCHOOL

The Brown Schools Education Corporation

May 20, 2002

Dear Educator:

The Brown Schools in conjunction with Texas A&M University is conducting a study on alternative educational settings and student in a correctional system. The Brown Schools and Texas A&M are interested in the "Effective School Correlates" to alternative education. Accordingly, a survey has been arranged to be conducted which will seek your professional opinion about these correlates.

I have selected three schools within The Brown Schools system here in Harris County to participate in this survey. You are one of approximately eighty teachers and administrators selected. Participation is entirely voluntary.

If you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me or you may contact Mr. Vance Cortez-Rucker at 936-258-2712 or by email at Rucker@imsday.com.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David D. Wood

David D. Wood
National Director
Public Education Group

2525 Murworth Street, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77054

APPENDIX D

EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATE

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATES

A Survey
of the
Effective School Correlates
in an
Alternative School Setting
by Teachers and Administrators
in Selected Charter Schools
in Harris County, Texas

Instructions: For each of the indicators below please assign an overall rating. Remember the rating indicates whether you feel the indicators **are relevant to your alternative school.** Any indicator you feel is not relevant, please recommend a change in the space provided.

Correlate A: Clear and Focused School Mission
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	The school has a mission statement developed with input from all stakeholders.	1	2	3	4

Recommended Changes

_____

_____

		Relevant			Irrelevant
2)	The mission statement states that all children can learn the adopted curriculum.	1	2	3	4

Recommended Changes

_____

_____

		Relevant			Irrelevant
3)	The mission is evidenced in the routine activities of the school.	1	2	3	4

Recommended Changes

_____

_____

		Relevant			Irrelevant
4)	An annual planning process is in place to address the changing needs of the school.	1	2	3	4

Recommended Changes

_____

_____

Correlate B: Instructional Leadership
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	The principal meets with teachers to plan and discuss the instructional program.	1	2	3	4

Recommended Changes

_____

_____

		Relevant			Irrelevant
2)	The principal is visible in classrooms.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
3)					
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
	The principal monitors student progress.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
4)					
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
	The principal limits interruptions of class.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
5)					
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
	Teachers and administrators work to establish academic benchmarks and to help students achieve them	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
6)					
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
	The Superintendent and Board of Education are actively involved to make the instructional program work successfully.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

Correlate C: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	The school's academic benchmarks are shared with stakeholder groups.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

		Relevant			Irrelevant
2)	Students are given regular feedback on their performance.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
3)	Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's academic progress.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
4)	Parents are provided appropriate and timely information regarding their child's behavioral progress.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

Correlate D: High Expectations for All
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	Teachers involve all students in the instructional process and expect them to master the academic benchmarks.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
2)	Teachers believe their teaching is a key factor in helping students learn.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
3)	Teachers believe that a student's race, color, and background are not primary factors in his achievement	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

Correlate E: The Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on Task
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	Teachers have developed effective teaching-learning processes and methods.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
2)	Teachers use a variety of materials and activities.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
3)	Teachers use the student's culture and heritage to develop a positive self-concept.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
4)	Additional activities and materials are provided for students who fail to show progress.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

Correlate F: Safe and Orderly School Environment for Learning
Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	The school and classroom atmosphere is pleasant, orderly, and inviting, discipline is effective.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

		Relevant			Irrelevant
2)	Students are accountable for good citizenship.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
3)	The school is a safe and secure place to be.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

Correlate G: Positive Home-School Relations

Indicators:

		Relevant			Irrelevant
1)	The school provides opportunities for parents to discuss and react to the school mission, goals, and reporting systems.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
2)	Parents and community have a channel of communication with teachers and administrators and are actively involved in helping make decisions.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				
		Relevant			**Irrelevant**
3)	The district encourages citizens and businesses to work with the school.	1	2	3	4
	Recommended Changes				
	_____				
	_____				

VITA

Vance Cortez-Rucker received his Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education from Ouachita Baptist University in Arkadelphia, Arkansas in 1983. He entered the Educational Administration program at the University of Texas in Denton, Texas in 1985. He completed his class and research requirements at Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas in 2007 and received his Ph.D. His research interest includes effective school and rural schools and is presently completing a book on his experiences in rural schools in the bush of Alaska.

Mr. Cortez-Rucker may be reached at P.O. box 337, Angoon, Alaska 99820. His e-mail address is vance@planethouston.com.